Imprimatur,

Ex Æd. Lambethanis *oct.* 31.

Tho. Tomkyns *RR^mo.* *in Chriſto Patri ac Domino Domino* Gilbert. *divina providentia Archiepiſcopo* Cantuarienſi à *ſacris domeſticis.*

Imprimatur,

Ex Æd. Lambethanis *oct.* 31.

Tho. Tomkyns *RR^mo.* *in Chriſto Patri ac Domino Domino* Gilbert. *divina providentia Archiepiſcopo* Cantuarienſi à *ſacris domeſticis.*

S. 14

THE UNREASONABLENESS OF THE ROMANISTS,

Requiring our COMMUNION

With the present

Romish Church:

Or, a

DISCOURSE

Drawn from the perplexity and uncertainty of the Principles, and from the Contradictions betwixt the Prayers and Doctrine of the present *Romish* Church; to prove that 'tis unreasonable to require us to joyn in Communion with it.

LONDON,

Printed by *T. R.* for *Richard Royston*, Bookseller to his most Excellent Majesty, 1670.

THE PREFACE.

AFter the Aſcention of our Saviour, *the* Apoſtles *ſeparated themſelves for the Publiſhing of the Goſpel through all the World; and where they ſaw any likelyhood of a plentifull Harveſt, they beſtowed there the greateſt Paines in the Planting of the Chriſtian Religion. Their firſt care was for the converting of the* Cities, *for the greater would draw after it the leſſer; and* Religion *ſettled in the Cities, would ſooner diffuſe it ſelf through the adjacent* Villages: *By the ſame rea-*

ſon their Care was the Converſion of the Metropolis *of the* Roman *World, that from that head Religion might more opportunely be conveyed into all the members of that vaſt* Empire; *And by its Authority and Example, other Countries, ſubject to that City, might be moved to embrace the Faith,* Et cito pervios haberet populos prædicatio generalis, quos unius teneret Regimen civitatis *. *In the Converſion of this place both the Doctor of the* Gentiles, *and the Apoſtle of the* Circumciſion, *and* (Tertullian de præſcriptionibus *mentions alſo)* S. John *beſtowed their time and Labour: Here they Preached, here they Suffered;* quibus Romanis

* Leo *Serm. de Nat.* Petri & Pauli.

Romanis Evangelium Petrus & Paulus ſanguine quoque ſuo ſignatum reliquerunt; *and both founded this Church*, a glorioſiſſimis duobus Apoſtolis, Petro & Paulo Romæ fundatur, & conſtituitur Eccleſia *. *Both exerciſed here their Apoſtolical authority, and by* Epiphanius Hereſ. 27. *are both called Biſhops of* Rome †; *Both of them appointed* Linus *to that Biſhoprick*, Fundantes & inſtruentes Eccleſiam Lino Epiſcopatum tradiderunt *. *The Faith of this* Roman *Church was famous throughout the World, their Sufferings were great, for they uſually endured the firſt heat of the* Roman *fury: Their Biſhops for the firſt*

* Tert. adv. Marc. li. 4.

† Irenæ. lib. 3. cap. 3.

* Irenæ. ibi.

300 years were most of them Crowned with Martyrdom; Polydor Virgil * saith, that seven only of 32 escaped; the Church thus founded in the Imperial City was most observed, and Eyed both by the Heathen, and by the Christian: By the Heathen it was so eyed that usually it became the mark of their fury, and their Edicts of Persecutions were first executed in the City before they were transmitted into the remoter Provinces: The Martyrs here were so numerous that it became the businesse of 7 Notaries to record their sufferings, as Platina reports. This Church was much eyed by the Christians, being placed in the chief City; The Faith of

* De invent. rerum Li. 9. cap. 1.

of this Church like a Candle *on a* Hill *was more conſpicuous, and its ſuffering was more obſerved than in Remoter places: The Biſhops of* Rome *were commonly the moſt Eminent, like the choiceſt Soldiers, placed in the* Front *of the Battle: The* Clergy *here were very numerous, according to the largeneſſe of the City; for in* Pontians *time (which was about the year* 231.) *there were* 236 Cardinal *Prieſts, as* Polydor Virgil * *reports from* Guido Archidiaconus *and* Franciſcus Zabarella, *and theſe he explaines to be ſuch who had chiefly cure of Soules. This Church being thus advanced by the dignity of the City, the eminency of its founders, and the*

* *De Invent. rerum. l. 4. cap. 9.*

worth of its members, was accounted the chief *Church, the Chair of* Peter, *the* Apostolick *See, and* Valentinian *in an Epistle to* Theodosius *saith*, Antiquity *hath given the Bishop of the* Roman *City a Principality of* Priest-hood *above all. After that the World came into the Church, and the* Ensign *of Christianity became the Banner of the Empire, the* Roman *Church encreased in Dignity, Revenue, and Credit; for the Christian* Emperours *out of their respect to Religion, honouring the Bishops, enlarging their Revenue, and increasing their Dignity, did shew more particular kindnesse to the Church of* Rome, *where was the* Seat *of their*

Empire,

Empire, and which had gained ſuch eſteem for the merit of its Founders. In ſhort time the Riches of the Roman *Biſhoprick or'e-topp'd the neighbouring places, the Pomp of their Biſhops was ſuitable to the magnificence of the City: Now Communion with the* Roman *Biſhop was made the* Teſt *and* Mark *of Orthodoxneſſe in Religion: Now it was decreed by the Emperours, that it ſhould not be Lawful for the Biſhops of* Gallia *or other Provinces to attempt any thing without the Authority of the venerable* Pope *of the Eternal City**; *and in all things they haſt'ned to increaſe the Authority and Honour of that See,* per omnia properamus honorem & Autho-

* *Apud* Baron. *an.* 445. *n.* 9.

ritatem

ritatem veſtræ *Sedis* creſcere, *ſaith* Juſtinian *. *But now the* Roman *Church, which by the favour of* Emperours, *and affection of* Prelates, *in reverence of S.* Peter, *and reſpect to the Imperial Seat, had gained this dignity and honour, began to ſwell with higher aimes, and to Aſpire to greater Priviledges. If the Councel of* Calcedon *would advance* Conſtantinople *to the ſecond Patriarchſhip, upon the ſame reaſon as the Fathers had dignified* Rome; Propter imperium civitatis illius; *and would now give equal Priviledges to new* Rome, *judging it reaſonable that the City adorned with the Empire and Senate, ſhould enjoy equal Priviledges with*

* *L. Sedet. C. de Sum. trin.*

the

the elder Rome *. *then* Leo *epiſt.* 58. *to the Empreſſe* Pulcheria *durſt pronounce*, Conſenſiones Epiſcoporum ſanctorum Canonum apud Nicæam Conditorum Regulis repugnantes in irritum mittimus, & per authoritatem Beati *Petri* Apoſtoli generali prorſus definitione caſſamus, *we do make the agreement of the Biſhops repugnant to the Canons of the Council of* Nice (*for ſo he conceived the advancement of* Conſtantinople *to be*) *null, and by the authority of the bleſſed Apoſtle* Peter *do make them void. If the Councel of* Sardis *. (*to honour the memory of S.* Peter) *appoints in the caſe of a Biſhop or Prieſt, that if he think he hath good reaſon why the cauſe*

* Conc. Calced. Act. 16.

* Conc. Sardic. Can. 3. n. 8.

cauſe ſhould be examined over again, thoſe who heard the cauſe ſhould write to Julius *the Roman Biſhop, and if he think fit it ſhould be re-examined, that it may be ſo, and he may appoint Judges; and if he does not think it fit to be re-examined, then what he doth determine ſhall be confirmed. Or in caſe of a Biſhop depoſed, if he appeal to the Roman Biſhop, that Biſhop if he thinks fit may write to the Neighbouring Biſhops that they determine the cauſe; and in caſe the depoſed Biſhop deſire the Roman Biſhop to ſend one of his Presbyters; it ſhall be in his power; and if he will ſend ſome with his Authority to judge the cauſe with the other Biſhops, he may do it: This priviledge*

priviledge ſhall be extended higher ; that inferiour Prieſts may appeal to the Roman See out of any Provinces, that the cauſes of Biſhops may be called to Rome *and heard by him alone, and this profitable Authority of receiving Appeals was pretended by* Zoſimus * *from the Canons of the* Nicene *Councel, though no ſuch thing could be found in any of the Copies of that Councel in the* Eaſtern *Church, as* Cyril *of* Jeruſalem *and* Atticus *of* Conſtantinople *teſtified ; afterwards this priviledge was ſo heightned that all cauſes almoſt were drawn to* Rome *, all juriſdiction hindred, and cauſes were determined more according to mens gifts than their rights. If the Antients did ſhow*

* *Cod. Con. Ecl. Affr. in Conc. Carth.* 419.

* *Urſperg. in Phil. Imp.*

ſhow any reſpect to the Roman *See, allowing it the priviledge to be the firſt Seat, and that Biſhop to be firſt of all Prieſts, ſo* Juſtinian * *determines according to the ancient Canons, that he be the chiefeſt of Biſhops and the firſt Patriarch, and have the firſt place in Councels before the other Patriarchs; and i'le add another priviledge, which Pope* Julius *mentions* * *as an Eccleſiaſtical Law, that without the* Roman *Biſhop no decrees ſhould be made in Councels: Now theſe priviledges ſhall be extended higher, that all other Patriarchs ſhall be his Subjects* *, *that by divine right the Biſhop of* Rome *is head of the Church,* Caput & Cardo à Domino, & non ab alio Apoſtolica

* *Nov.* 131. *Cap.* 2.

* *Socrat. li.* 2. *Cap.* 13.

* *Dſt.* 22. *Ca de Conſtant.*

ſtolica Sedes conſtituta eſt, & ſicut cardine oſtium, ſic hujus Apoſtolicæ Sedis authoritate omnes Eccleſiæ reguntur *. *That it is of neceſſity to Salvation for every Humane Creature to be under the* Roman *Biſhop, ſaith* Boniface *(who lived* 1294.*) in the extravagant* *. *If the Ancient Church allowed him the priviledg to ſee the Canons of the Church put in Execution, and as the firſt Seat to ſee that the Laws made by general Conſent be Obſerved: This Law ſhall be extended higher, that he may diſpenſe with the Laws made by general Councels, unleſſe it be in Articles of faith* †; *That no Councel can put Bounds to his power, as* Paſchal

* Diſt. 22. C. Sacr. Eccl. Rom.

* Vnn. de major. & Obed.

† Cauſ. 25. Qu. 1.

chal *the Second* (*who was Pope* 1099.) *Bragged, that if the Council ſhould add any* Clauſa irritans virt. *Should declare all diſpenſations to be Null, and Invallid which are contrary to their Canons; yet the Pope hath power to diſpenſe in thoſe caſes, as* Victoria * *ſaith. Again if the Ancients did account the Union with the* Roman *Church to be the Teſt of Orthodoxneſſe in Religion, as* Hierom *tells* Damaſus, *I following no Chief but Chriſt, am joyned in Communion to thy Bleſſedneſſe, that is to the Chair of* Peter, *and he that gathereth not with thee Scatereth, that is, who is not* Chriſt's *is* Antichriſt's, *becauſe the* Roman *Church at that time*

* *Relect. 4. de pot. Papæ N. 4. prop. 4.* —

time was free from those Heresies under which the Eastern *Church had groaned, and therefore if they joyned with the* Roman, *it was a sign that they Renounced the Errors which afflicted the* Eastern ; *and so it was Required by the Emperours* *, *that all should professe the Religion which it appeared that* Damasus, *and* Peter *Bishop of* Alexandria *follow*, (i. e.) *that according to the Discipline of the Apostles and the Doctrine of the Gospel, we believe* one Deity of the Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost. *Now what they spake of the present time*, *the* Roman *Bishops pretend to be constant priviledges of that See*; *for they lost no time to inhanse their*

* *L. cunctos C. de Sum. trin.*

own greatneſſe: Leo *was hammering at it,* Hactenus fides Petri non defecit, *hitherto it hath not failed;* *and he adds,* Nec defectura Creditur in Throno ſuo * *that the* Roman *Church neither hath Erred, nor ſhall Err* †: *and in diſſention about matters of faith, he that ſhall take that ſide to which the Biſhop of* Rome *adheres, ſhall be ſecure, for Chriſt hath prayed that* Peters *faith faile not. The firſt ground of the priviledg, was becauſe that the Tradition of the Chriſtian Doctrine concerning that point, was preſerved ſincere in the* Roman *Church: For the Emperours ſay they would have all the people to profeſſe that Religion which* S. Peter *delivered to the* Romans,

* Leo. Epiſt. 9. ad Pat. Antioch.

† Greg. 7. li. 2. poſt. Ep. 55.

Romans, *and which it appears Pope* Damaſus *followed*; *This afterwards the* Popes *claim, as the fruits of* Chriſts *Prayer for* S. Peter, *and the priviledge of their See. By theſe Steps the* Roman *Biſhop aſcended to that height of Power he enjoyed, what was either by conſent or Cuſtom, either in honour of* S. Peter *or Reſpect to the Imperial Seat, either for the greatneſſe of the City, the Eminency of many Biſhops, or the Orthodoxneſſe in Religion (while the World groaned under* Arianiſme) *aſcribed to the* Roman *Biſhop, was afterwards challenged to be due by Divine right. Then the* Siſter *challenged to be the* Mother, *the* fellow-Servant *to be the* Miſtreſſe *of all*

Churches, and the Roman *Biſhop who was ſo often called by* Cyprian *his* Brother *and* Collegue, *to be in effect the* Lord *and* Maſter: *The Canons were trodden under foot, the Authority of Biſhops depreſt, and all things brought into confuſion, his flatterers, and thoſe that thrived by his greatneſſe labouring ſtill to advance his Power; they cried him up to have* Omnia jura in ſcrinio pectoris, *all Laws contained in his Breſt* *, *that he was above all Laws, and his bare will a ſufficient Reaſon, and his decretal Epiſtles were equal not only to the Canons of general Councils, but they were alſo Reckoned among the Canonical Scriptures, and yet this Blaſphemous*

* *Conſt. provinc. de temp. ord. gloſſ. in C. 2. expreſſ. Lauc. init. jur. Canon. L. 1. tit. 3. de Eccl. Conſt.*

phemous saying fathered on S. Auguſtin lib. 2. de Doctrina Chriſtiana *, *is not expunged either by* Thomas Manriques *when he ſet forth the cenſures on the gloſſes by command of* Pius Quintus *or by* Sixtus Faber *Mr. of the Apoſtolick Pallace, in his Cenſures publiſhed by command of* Greg. 13th. 1580. *nor did he only challenge a primacy in Spirituals, but even in Temporals as* Bonif. 8. *in the extravagant* † *ſaith, that in the Churches Power are two Swords, the Spiritual aud the Temporal, and ſo Pope* Nicolas *tells the* Milanois, *that God gave to* Peter *the Keykeeper of Eternal life,* Terreni ſimul & cœleſtis Imperij curam,

* *Diſtinct.* 19. *in Canonicis.*

† *Extrav. Una. de major. & obedient.*

That he ſhall take the charge of the Earthly and Heavenly Empire, and from hence the gloſſe Argues, that the Pope hath both the Spiritual and Temporal Sword. Or if this Power ſeem to be too extravagant, yet to this day he challengeth a Power* indirecte & in ordine ad Spiritualia, *over Temporal things, although he do not pretend to a direct dominion; as if all the Princes of the Earth were only his Vaſſals, and held their Dominion in Fee of him; for Princes are grown Wiſer than to have their Crowns ſo eaſily ſpurn'd off their heads, yet he hath as full a power over all things by this pretence of* indirecte & in ordine ad Spiritualia; *and therefore*

* Gloſſ. in Cæleſt. diſt. 22. omnes.

Victo-

Victoria * *calls it* Amplissimam potestatem : *for he can both when, and how much he thinks it necessary in order to Spiritual things, make and unmake Princes, divide Empires, and do many other things of the like sort, as* Victoria *add's : And that he hath the supream Power in temporal things, all grant him saies* Bellarmine † *except the Hereticks,* tutti lo Concedono, eccetto g'l Heretici : *and the only difference in these Authors Opinions is in the manner how he hath this Power ; Some think he hath it as Temporal Princes have it : Others think that the Power of the Pope is properly and in it self Spiritual, but in order to spiritual affaires may medle*

* *Relect. 1. de pot. Eccles. N. 12.*

† *Risposta del Card.* Bellar. *a'l 3a prop. di. Giou. Marsilio.*

medle with temporal things with moſt full Authority, con pieniſſima Autorita ; *and if it be profitable for Chriſtianity, may diſpoſe of the kingdoms and Empires of Chriſtians as they have done very oft* ; *thus he concludes the anſwer to the* third Propoſition. *When the Biſhops of* Rome *were come to this greatneſſe, Kings muſt hold their ſtirrups, the Emperour muſt bring the Water when the Pope waſheth, he muſt pour it out, he muſt bring the firſt diſh, if Princes will be ordered by their* Mr. *of Ceremonies* * : *then the Biſhops began to uſe the Imperial Robes, then they ware a triple Crown, in ſign of his Empire he weares an Imperial Crown, in ſign that he is*

* *Sacr. Cærem. l. 1. tit. 3.*

Pope

Pope he uſeth a Miter *, and in all great proceſſions the ſame Honour is ſhowed to him which was wont to be uſed to the Roman Emperours †; at the mention of his Name in their Prayers for the Pope, the Prieſts muſt bow their Heads *, His feet muſt be kiſſed both by Princes and Prelates, ſolius Papæ pedes omnes deoſculentur is Gregory the 7th's dictate †. Much more of their Pride and Vanity might be reckoned up, even while they pretended the Humility to be the ſervants of ſervants; and what care of Religion can be expected in them, who every day ſtudied to advance their own greatneſſe, and to raiſe themſelves above the Height of the greateſt

* Durand. Ration. div. offic. l. 3. c. 17.

† Dur. ibi in fine.

* Miſs. Reform. in ritub. celeb. miſs. c. 5. de Oratione. n. 2.

† L. 2. poſt. Ep. 55.

teſt Monarchs? How can we imagine that Tares ſhould not be ſown, when thoſe who pretended to be the Watch-men ſlept? How can we judg the purity of Religion to have been preſerved, when the piety and Learning of the Clergy decreaſed, and Pride, Covetouſneſs, and Ambition increaſed? The weeds were grown up though few obſerved when they firſt peeped out of the ground, after-ages ſaw Tares had almoſt covered the Corn, but the World was too buſie in Contentions about greatneſſe and honour to mind the firſt ſprouting of them: It was the frequent complaint of Pious men, that abuſes were crept into the Church, and that there needed a Refor-

Reformation in Capite & membris, *they complained of the multitude of Canons, and abundance of Ceremonies:* Multæ Conſtitutiones Præſulum, de quibus non ſine cauſa eſt publica Orbis quærela, &c. *There are many Conſtitutions of Prelates, which are juſtly complained of by the World, there are in many Churches ſuperfluous, needleſſe, and ſuperſtitious Ceremonies ſaies* Eraſmus *. *Many complained of the vain and ſuperſtitious uſe of Reliques and Images*: Manifeſtius eſt quam ut multis explicari verbis debeat, imaginum cultum & ſimulachrorum nimium invaluiſſe, &c. *It is too plain, that the worſhip of Images had too*

* *Declar. ad Cens.* Paris n. 58.

too much increaſed, and the affection, or rather ſuperſtition of the People was too much indulged; ſo that our men did ſeem to omit nothing of that high adoration given by the Pagans *to their* Statues, *or of the extream vanity which they allowed in making, and worſhiping of their Images, as* Caſſander *acknowledgeth* *; *great were the abuſes which were crept into the Church in the Prayers to* Saints, *in the immoderate Prayers of the Bleſſed* Virgin, *in the chooſing of particular* Patron-Saints, *in their proceſſions, Pilgrimages, over-valuing of monaſtical habits, in their Faſts, in their Prayers, in their* Legends *of Saints lives, in their forging of miracles, Revelations,*

* *Conſultatio. tit. de imaginibus.*

Revelations, and Stories which might ſerve to increaſe the Prieſts profits. Great were the Abuſes in the Popes Exorbitant power, in his proviſions, reſervations, diſpenſations, exemptions, exactions, indulgencies, &c. T'is needleſſe at preſent to reckon up all the abuſes both in Doctrine and diſcipline, ſome complaining of one thing, ſome of another, moſt concluding there was a neceſſity of a Reformation: But how ſhould it be effected when the great diſeaſe lay as it were in the head? Little could be expected from general Councils, when they neither could now be called without the Popes conſent, nor accounted Valid without his Confirmation; when the Biſhops ſtiled themſelves

ſelves, Dei & Apoſtolicæ Sedis gratia Epiſcopi: *When they had not only ſworn Canonical obedience to him, which is alwaies underſtood*, in Licitis & honeſtis, *in things which were honeſt, and allowed by the Canons*; *But an Oath of fealty as their* Ceremoniale Epiſcoporum * *calls it, that they would defend* Regalia ſancti Petri, *the Royalties of S.* Peter, *under which he comprehended many of his uſurpations: Little could be expected from the Biſhops in their ſeveral Dioceſſes, ſince all were now dependants on the* Pope, *and if they oppoſed the incroachments on their rights, or the innovations ſtealing into the Church, the Pope preſently threatned*

* *Cerem. Epiſ. tit. de pallio.*

threatned, concutere candelabrum eorum, *to ſhake their Candleſtick, as* Adrian *the* 4th. * *Writ to* Theobald *Archbiſhop of* Canterbury: *Then they muſt anſwer for it at* Rome, *where the uſual confutation was by fire and faggot. At length the wiſe providence of God opened a way to a Reformation in many Countries; if in ſome places the proceedings were ſomewhat tumultuous, I juſtify not the faults of any, but only acknowledg the bleſſing which God hath beſtowed, who can bring good out of evil. At home the Reformation was begun by conſent of the* King, *the* Lords *Spiritual and Temporal, the Approbation of the* Univerſities, *the determination*

* William Thorn *Chron. in Sylveſt. Allat. anno.* 1153.

of the Convocation: *Thus it was carried on in the reign of his ſucceſſor* Edward 6th. *When it was re-eſtabliſhed under Queen* Elizabeth, *it was in a regular way, by a legal abrogation of thoſe Statutes made in Queen* Maryes *time, and the Revival of the Lawes made by King* Edward, *with Synodical conſent: All which things are fully and Satisfactorily handled by Sir.* Roger Twiſden, *and Dr.*Heylin; *after the Re-eſtabliſhment of the Reformation by Queen* Elizabeth, *there were few or no Recuſants known in* England *for many years, as is conſtantly avouched by our Writers, who lived neir thoſe times, few of the* Romiſh *perſwaſion (if at any time they went*

to

to Maſs) *refuſed to be preſent at our ſervice* *; *and when afterwards* Pius Quintus *by his* Bull, *had forbid thoſe whom he called* Catholicks *to reſort to our* Prayers, *there appeared only few who adhered to the* Romiſh *Religion*; *the Popes laboured hard to keep up their party here, by founding Seminaries for the inſtructing of the* Engliſh *youth abroad, and by frequent Miſſions of Prieſts hither, to propagate and Defend the Romiſh Doctrine*; *yet during the reign of Queen* Elizabeth, *King* James *and King* Charles *the firſt, Popery decayed*; *till the troubles of our late warrs gave the Romiſh emiſſaries opportunity to pervert many unſtable perſons, who either diſcontented with their*

* *Lord Coke's charge at* Norwich. 1606.

ſufferings at home, or pinched with neceſſity, or offended with the many Sects which the licentiouſneſſe of Warr had begot, or couzened with pretenſes of the Antiquity, unity, glory, *and* ſplendor *of the* Romiſh *Church, or perhaps allured with the pleaſing Doctrine and Opinions, wherby many Romiſh* Caſuiſts *gratifie Sinners, revolted from us; and whether the reſtauration of Peace and Order may reclaim thoſe, whoſe Sufferings, and troubles alienated from us, God only knowes; There is great talk ſtill of the increaſe of* Popery, (*the* Papiſts *ſtriving to credit their cauſe by theſe reports of numerous* Proſelites) *though I hope it is not ſo, as I ſee no reaſonable ground*

ground that it ſhould be ſo; yet the reports of Enemies ſhould at leaſt alarum us to be as Active in maintaining our ground, as they are in ſtriving to gain it, and unleſs we are weary of our Religion, to ſhew as much zeal in defending, as they do earneſtneſs in aſſaulting; This hath Occaſioned the enſuing Diſcourſe, in which my deſign is from the doubtfulneſs and perplexity of the Romiſh *Doctrine, the Superſtitious vanity of many allowed practiſes in their Church, the abſurdities in their publique Offices, and the contradictions betwixt their Prayers and Doctrins to diſſwade the fond Admirers of the* Romiſh *Religion, and to en-*

deavour to reclaim them who a
ready to embrace their Errors fo
Catholick truth.

CHA

o are
rs for

A P.

Optabilior est Fur quam Mendax assiduus; vtrique vero Perditionis hæreditatem consequentur. Eccles. 20. vers. 25.

Paas

CHAP. I.

The first Consideration *I propose, shall be from the doubtfulnesse, and Uncertainty of many Doctrines in the Church of* Rome.

IT is not Reasonable to Adhere to that Church, which Commands us to believe (under pain of damnation) Doctrines which are uncertiane and dubious: But the Church of *Rome* doth Require such things; *pro.* In the Creed of *Pius* 4th * There are several things Required as Conditions of Communion with that Church, and which their Clergy are bound to swear that they truly Believe, and will constantly defend, and that they will take Care

* *Bulla Pij 4th Super form. Juram Profess: fid.*

that they be taught to, and Believed by those who are under their Charge, and this also they Acknowledge to be the *Catholick* faith, without which there is no *Salvation*: But now many of these things (which they are Bound to hold according to the *Letter* of the Decree (are Uncertain and Doubtfull, and from their own Principles and Confessions will apear so.

1. I instance in the *Artic'e* that they acknowledge *the holy Catholick Apostolick Roman Church to be the Mother and Mistrisse of all Churches*: But there is no Certainty of the truth of this Article, for it is either meant of the Churches united under the Obedience of the *Roman* Bishop, or else of the Particular Dioceses of *Rome*: It cannot be meant of the Universal Church which obeyes the Universal Vicar of Christ, as *Suarez* phraseth it: for all Churches are supposed by them members of that Universal Church, and the Universal Church to be the Collection of all Churches: Now it is improper

proper to call the Univerſal Church A *Mother* of all Churches, for all Churches are the ſame with the *Univerſal* Church, and nothing can be called a *Mother* to it ſelfe; Again, it cannot be a *Miſtriſſe* of all Churches, for it is only a Society of all Churches United together; and Suppoſe all thoſe Churches throughout the world, of which this Univerſal Church is made, I aske what is the *Miſtriſſe* to all theſe Churches? either tis the *Roman* particular Church which I ſhall ſhew to be otherwiſe, or elſe they muſt ſay that all theſe Churches United are a *Miſtriſſe* to all Churches, when yet they ſuppoſe no other can be a Church but what is United with theſe, which is abſurd. If they mean the particular *Roman* Church, then firſt, that cannot be a *Mother* of all Churches, which in order of time was founded after ſome Churches, unleſſe wee could ſay the *Mother* might be born after the *Daughter*, but the *Roman* Church was founded after the Church of *Jeruſalem*, and therefore

St.

St. *Hierome* * sayes, the Church founded in *Jerusalem*, begat the Churches of the whole world, *Ecclesia in Hierusalem fundata totius orbis Ecclesias seminavit*, and the *Synodical* Letter * from the Council of *Constantinople* to *Damasus* and the *Western Bishops* calls *Cyril*, the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, the *Mother* of all Churches: Again, the *Roman* Church was founded after the Church of *Antioch*, where the *Disciples* were first called *Christians*. *Quæ prima omnium ausa est proferre Christianum nomen, atque Nascentis Evangelij gloriam prædicare*, saith *Polidor Virgil* * I may ad, after the Church of *Britaine*, for *Suarez* * confesseth, it was from the first Rising of the Gospel, and *Baronius* from some manuscripts in the *Vatican* affixeth it to the 35th year of our Lord, which was near nine years before the founding of the *Roman* Church; If then the *Roman* Church was founded after some other Churches, it is then uncertain and doubtful how we can acknowledg it to be the *Mother*

* *Com. in Isa. 2.*

* *Theodoret. Eccl. Hist. l. 5. c. 9.*

Acts 11, 26.

* *De Invent. rerum l. 4. c. 2.*

* *Defens. Fidei Cathol. l. 1. c. 1.*

ther of all Churches, and profeſſe this as an *Article* of Faith without which there is no Salvation.

Secondly, If it be not *de fide* that the *Roman* particular Church ſhall never err in matters of Faith, then it is abſurd to make this profeſſion alwaies, that ſhe is the Mother and Miſtreſs of all Churches, for that cannot alwaies be the Mother and Miſtreſs of all Churches, which may ceaſe to be a member of the Catholick Church: But even by their own confeſſions, it is not *de fide* that the *Roman* particular Church ſhall alwaies remain, or alwaies adhere to the true faith: for that *Rome* ſhall be the Seat of *Antichriſt* is the opinion of many *Romaniſts*; and if it be the Seat of *Antichriſt*, it is uncertain how it can remain the Miſtreſs of all Churches; again, that it ſhall not fail, it is only *pia & probabiliſſima opinio**: But not ſo certain that the contrary can be called *Heretical*, or manifeſtly erroneous; yea, there is no promiſe (if we look on that Church

Ribera & Viega *in Apoc.* 17.

* Bellar. *l.* 4. *de Rom. pont. c.* 4.

Church preciſely) that it ſhall never revolt from the *Catholick* faith, ſaies *Suarez* *: Now if it be not *de fide* that the *Roman* particular Church ſhall never err in matters of faith, and that there is no promiſe to ſupport it from failing, then 'tis abſur'd to profeſs alwaies this *Article* as neceſſary to Salvation, *That ſhe is the Mother and Miſtreſſe of all Churches.*

* *Defenſ. fid. Cathol. l. 2. c. 5. 5.*

Thirdly, If the *Romaniſts* ſhall ſay that the particular Church, taken abſtractly from its Biſhop may err, but conſidered as united with its head the *Univerſal* Biſhop then it can never err, or fall away, *propter Cathedram Petri præſidentem*, ſaies *Suarez* †; for the *Roman* Biſhop is the *Vicar* of *Chriſt*, and *Head* of the whole Church, the *Father* and *Teacher* of all Chriſtians, to whom in St. *Peter* was delivered the full power of feeding, and governing the univerſal Church, as the *Florentine* Council determines: ſo that whatſoever Church is in *Union* with him, by vertue of the priviledg derived to him by

† *Defenſ. fid. Cathol. &c. l. 3. c. 5. n. 6, 7*

by St. *Peter* cannot fall into any error, *hoc habet quælibet alia Ecclesia sub eadem ratione & Unione spectata*, saies *Suarez* *: But now if the foundation of this Article be doubtful and uncertain, it will follow that this Article it self is doubtful and uncertain also. First then, (setting aside the question about St. *Peters* universal Pastor-ship which contains many perplexities) it is uncertain, whether there be by *Divine right* a successor to that universal Pastor-ship, for there is no mention in Scripture of a successor, no Command to appoint one, and no evident consequence that any such was appointed; and if there can be no certain command produced to appoint a successor, nor evident consequence that by *divine* Command any such was appointed, then it is uncertain whether there be by *divine* right a successor to that universal Pastor-ship. *Secondly*, It is uncertain whether those priviledges which our Saviour obtained by his Prayer for St. *Peter*, are

* *Defens. fid. &c. ibi. n. 6.*

are to be extended to his Succeſſor, for either all muſt be allowed to a Succeſſor, or only ſome priviledges: if all priviledges, then the Succeſſor of St. *Peter* can neither err in his own judgment, nor teach any error to others: But this is more then themſelves require, for the former priviledg *fortaſſe non deſcendit ad poſtelos*, perhaps it hath not deſcended to his ſucceſſors, ſaith *Bellarmine*,* and *Canus*† gives the account of *Pighius* defending the Popes (by vertue of this Prayer) being free from perſonal error: *Quamvis in multis locis dicit ſatis probabiliter de ſummi Pontificis autoritate, tamen non id ſpectandum quid dicit, ſed quid conſentaneum ſit ei dicere*, though he ſpeaks probably enough in many places of the Popes authority, yet that is not ſo much to be regarded what he ſaies, as what is fit for him to ſay, &c. for he adds in another place, it cannot be denied but the Pope may be an *Heretick*: If only ſome priviledges were here given to his ſucceſſor, as *infallibility*

* *l.* 4. *de* Rom. *Pont. c.* 3.
† Loc. *Com. lib.* 6. *c.* 8.

in

in Doctrine, that he ſhould never teach error, *tanquam Pontifex*, whereas our Saviour obtained for St. *Peter* the priviledg of perſevering in ſaving faith, and alſo infallibility in Doctrine: I demand then, where hath our Saviour diſtinguiſh't betwixt the priviledges here given to St. *Peter* and to his Succeſſors? Where is it ſaid what he hath obtained for the one, and what he hath obtained for the other? Where are thoſe words about Teaching, or Teaching others? or that a Succeſſor ſhould teach no errors, any more then St. *Peter* could? to ſum up this Argument, there can be no pretence that the priviledges procured for St. *Peter* belonged to his Succeſſors without our Saviours grant, but 'tis uncertain whether there be ſuch a grant; for either all priviledges muſt be allowed to his Succeſſors, which is more then they would have: or there muſt be ſome diſtinction betwixt thoſe priviledges which he procured for St. *Peter*, and which

he

he obtained for his ſucceſſors; but if there be none to be found there, as I have ſhewn, then it follows that it is uncertain whether the priviledges which our Saviour obtained for St. *Peter* are to be extended to his Succeſſors. *Thirdly*, granting there be a ſucceſſor, yet ſtill this *Article* that *the Biſhop of Rome is the ſucceſſor of St. Peter* (I mean in that large ſenſe the *Papiſts* take it) is uncertain and doubtful; for there is no Command extant that S. *Peter* ſhould fix his Seat at *Rome*, and no Divine Teſtimony that the Biſhop of *Rome* was appointed his ſucceſſor; and if there be neither Command that he ſhould be appointed his ſucceſſor, nor Divine Teſtimony that he was ſo appointed, it follows then that this Article, *The Biſhop of Rome is St. Peter's ſucceſſor*, is uncertain and doubtful; if there were a Command, then either it was given before St. *Peter* would have departed from *Rome*, or after his return thither again: if before St. *Peters* going out of Rome he

he received the command to fix his Seat there then it is not likely that he would have offered to remove thence which (as the ſtories quoted by *Bellarmin* * ſay) was a little before his Death: if after his return to *Rome* he received this Command, how does it appear, yea that he received ſuch Command either before his offering to depart, or after his return? what *Record*? what *Teſtimony*? what aſſurance of any ſuch thing? if there were a Teſtimony that the Biſhop of *Rome* was appointed to be St. *Peters* ſucceſſor, then either that Teſtimony is *Divine*, or *Humane*; if it be a *Divine* Teſtimony let it be produced; if it be only a *Humane* Teſtimony, then it makes only a *Humane* faith, and therefore it can be no Article neceſſary to be believed on pain of Damnation, that the Biſhop of *Rome* is St. *Peters* ſucceſſor. Again that which is not yet agreed on by the *Romiſh* Doctors, whether it be by Divine, or Humane right, cannot be made

* *l.* 1. *de Rom. pont. c.* 23.

by them a *Fundamental* Article of faith: But by what ground the Bishop of *Rome* succeeds to St. *Peter*, is not yet agreed on by them positively. Some say it is only by *Humane* right, so *Soto Armacanus*, and *Paludanus*, as *Suarez* * tells us; Some say it is not by *Divine* right, *Sed ex facto & morte Petri* saies *Azorius* *: *Bellarmine* speaks very perplexedly, it is not *ex prima institutione quæ legitur in Evangelio* †: not from the first institution which is in the Gospel, but then we would find the second institution, It is not (saies he) improbable that the Lord plainly Commanded *Peter*, &c. Again peradventure it is not by Divine right, although it pertain to the Catholick faith: Again it is not altogether *de fide* that the *Apostolick* Seat cannot be separated from the *Roman* Church: Again *Christ* did not plainly Command it, but is said to Command it, because *Peter* did translate his Seat thither by Gods inspiration: Again it does not appear how Christ Commanded

* *de trip. Virt. disp. 10. ſſ. 3. n. 9.*
* *Inſt. moral. part. 2. l. 4. c. 11.*
† Bell. *l. 2. de Rom. pont. c. 12. § at. vero § et quoniam Sobr. l. 4. c. 4. ſſ. at ſecundum §. reſpondeo ſſ. accedit.*

Peter

Peter that he ſhould place his Seat, poſ. it is not *de fide* that the See of *Rome* was eſtabliſhed by a *Divine* and immutable Command: Thus they are perplext where to found this right of ſucceſſion, and poſ. this propoſition the Biſhop of *Rome* is St *Peters* ſucceſſor muſt be even in their apprehenſion doubtful and uncertain: *Laſtly*, thoſe who pretend a *Divine* right, confeſs that it is not expreſs'd in Scripture, but only virtually contained in the principles revealed in it, for (ſaies *Suarez* *) *There was a primacy given to Peter, and that primacy was to laſt in the Church, and this muſt be a Succeſſion of Perſons in the ſame dignity, now the application of this Inſtitution and dignity to this particular Biſhoprick, is ſufficiently evidented by plain Tradition, and evident uſe.* But this is wholly uncertain; for firſt, where ſhall we find this *Tradition* that St. *Peter* appointed the *Roman* Biſhop his ſucceſſor. Secondly, where ſhall we find that the Biſhop of *Rome* muſt

* *Defenſ. fid. Cathol. &c. l. 2. c 13. n. 5.*

be his ſucceſſor becauſe he died Biſhop of *Rome*? for there is no certainty that St. *Peter* diſpoſed his *Univerſal* Biſhoprick to that See where he died, nor any certainty from the Nature of the thing, that it muſt fall to that place where he died; nor any certainty that the See which he laſt held hath any more priviledg on this account, than the *See* of *Antioch* where he firſt ſate: nor any certainty that the power of naming a ſucceſſor did not fall to the Apoſtles who ſurvived him, or to the Univerſal Church: till theſe things be certainly determined, it remaines ſtill uncertain that the Biſhop of *Rome* is St. *Peters* ſucceſſor.

Fourthly, *It is uncertain whether this or that particular Biſhop of Rome be the true Biſhop of Rome*, and *pro.* uncertain whether he be St. *Peters* ſucceſſor; and *pro.* higher ſtill, it is uncertain whether he hath the priviledges obtained by our Saviour for St. *Peter* and his ſucceſſors; and higheſt of all, whether the *Roman* Church,

Church, or any other is secured from Error by being subject to him: It is necessary *de fide* (saies *Suarez* *) that this man who is received by the common consent of the Church, as head of it, to which it is bound to obey, is the *true* Pope and successor of St. *Peter*: The reason he gives is this, *For it will be impossible, otherwise to believe certainly what he defines*; the same thing *Salmero* * speaks *that with same faith with which we believe Jesus Christ, we also believe Paulus fourth to be the Pope: Non tantum humana fide cui possit subesse falsum*: But now if this be uncertain then it cannot be *de fide*, and that it is uncertain appears thus. First, there may be *Schismes* in the Papacy, as hath been often (since the *Roman* Bishoprick became rather a Dignity than an Office; one Schisme lasted 50 years *; sometimes three Popes together as *Bened.* 13. *Greg.* 12. *John* 23. all of them pretended themselves to be the true Vicars of Christ, all of them as true Popes created Cardi-

* *De trip. Virtute disp.* 10. *sect.* 5. *n.* 2.

* *In Epistolas Pauli in genere part.* 3. *disp.* 2. *p.* 183.

* *Onuph. in Vita* Urban. 6.

 nalls,

* Platina *in Vita* Alex. 5.
* Onuph. *in Vita* Greg. 12.

nals *, and were allowed for Cardinals by the Council of *Conſtance* *, and electors of the ſucceeding Popes, the Cardinals of *Greg.* 12. and *Benedict.* 13, created *Alexander* the fifth in the Councils of *Piſa*; the Cardinals of theſe *Schiſmatical* Popes (of which ſome had been made Cardinals after the depoſition of theſe Popes at *Piſa*) were electors of *Martin* the fifth; either then they were all true Popes, or none of them, or onely one of them: they were not all true Popes, according to the *Romaniſts*, who tell us, there is but one *Legitimate* ſucceſſor, the reſt are *Rebells* and *Tyrants*: if onely one was true Pope, then thoſe Cardinalls which the Antipopes created, could not be lawfull Cardinals, nor lawfull Electors of the ſucceeding Popes; nay, nor according to an Ancient conſtitution could be Popes themſelves: and yet *Eugenius* the 4th was created Cardinal by *Greg.* 12th whom they confeſſe was a Schiſmatical Pope: if none of theſe

Onuph. *ibi.*

were

were true Popes, then for fifty years it was not neceſſary *de fide* to believe this or that man to be true Biſhop of *Rome*; nor was it certain that the Church of *Rome* was the Miſtreſs of all Churches, becauſe of its conjunction with the ſucceſſor of St. *Peter*, ſince all that time it was uncertain who was the true ſucceſſor. Secondly, it is uncertain whether there be no ſecret impediments, which hinder him from being true Pope, as whether the eſſentials required in the election and conſecration of the Pope be rightly performed, and pro. it cannot be *de fide* that this particular perſon is the true Biſhop of *Rome*. Firſt we cannot be certaine, abſolutely that the things required to the Election be performed: I'le inſtance in two things. Firſt, if the perſon be Elected by thoſe who have no power to Elect, then the Election is Null, for if they had no power to Elect then they could confer no power nor priviledg on the perſon whom they

do Elect, but 'tis uncertain whether the Election be performed by those who have power to elect; for the right they have is either by divine or humane Law; but it is uncertain that they have a wright, either by divine or humane Law, pro. First, it is uncertain that there is any right by divine Law, for let any man produce any divine Command or allowance; let them produce any proof that the authority of Electing the universal Bishop who shall be endowed with the priviledges given to St. *Peter*, was bestowed on the Cardinals. Secondly, the Election of the Pope was performed anciently by the suffrages of Clergy, and people, so *Cornelius* was chosen *electione Cleri & plebis*, saies *Ciprian** and *Gratian** quotes a saying of *Anacletus*, that God committed the Election *bonis Sacerdotibus, & Spiritualibus populis*, to good Priests and Spiritual people. The like we have from *Onuphrius** that the Election of the *Roman* Bishop, *more majorum*

* *Epist. l. 4. Epis. 2. 1.*

* *Distinct. 79. c. ejectionem.*

† *Annot. in Plat. vita Pelag. 2.*

majorum was *a Clero : S. P. Q. R.* by the Clergy *Senate*, and people of *Rome*. Now then if the Election by the Cardinals was *Jure divino* then the former way of election was Null, and there was no true Pope till *Celestin* the second, *qui primus sine ullo populi interventu Papa creatus est* * who was the first that was created Pope without the peoples medling in the Election. Secondly, it is uncertain that there is any right by humane Law, for then it must pear that a right was conferred on them by the consent of the Universal Church, that they were appointed *Proctors* for the Universal Church, to choose on their behalf the Universal Pastor ; but if none of this appeares, nay, nor certainly that they are the rightfull Electors of the Bishop of *Rome* barely *quà* Bishop of *Rome*, then it is not certain that the Pope is truly Elected, and therefore it cannot be *de fide* that this *Clement* the 9th is the successor of St. *Peter*. Secondly, if the Pope be

* Onuph. *annot. in* Plat. *vitæ innocent.* 2.

be elected for feare or profit, *viz.* if either the electors are compelled by Violence, or by bribes induced to elect one, if they be either overawd with power or corrupted with gifts, then the election is null: Pope *Nicholas** determines, he shall be accounted *Apostaticus non apostaticus*: and the Councels of *Lateran* under *Iulius* second declares that election to be null, and that by that election no power either in things temporall or sperituall shall be allowed to the person elected; but now if he look into the storyes of former elections, and the Mysteries of the *Conclave* at this day, he'le see, that it is vncertain to us whether the Pope be rightly elected: you may read the election of *Formosus* the first *Largitione Potius quam Virtute Assumitur ad Pontificatum* * for his gifts rather then Vertue of *Steph*, the sixth of *Sergius* the third of *Iohn* the eleventh raised by the Authority and indeavours of his Mother *Marocia*, sayes *Onuphorius* *; *Iohn* thirteenth seized on the Popedome

* Distinct. 79. c. siquis pecunia, &c.

* Platina in vita formosi.

* Annot. in Plat. in vita Iohn. 11th.

Popedome by the power of his father *Albericus* * : *Iohn* the eighteenth got the Popedome by the power of *Crescentius* whom it was supposed he had bribed *: *Silvester* the second obtayned Symonically first the Archbishoprick of *Rhemes* then of *Ravenna*, *lastly* the Popedome, *Majore Conatu diabolo adjuvante*: * *Clement* the second by the Emperors Compulsion, *Damasus* the second by plaine force without any Consent of the clergy or people enters on the Popedome yea it even became a Custome, that every Ambitious person might seize on Saint *Peters* Chayre, as *Platina* Complains *. What shall I say of *Boniface* the seventeenth who came in like a fox, and left nothing untried by bribing and cheating that he might obtaine the Popedome? or of *Alexander* the sixth who was reported to have Attained that dignity by the Ambition, and coveteousnes of some corrupt Prelates *? and how can we be absolutely certain that this is a true pope, when wee find the.

* Plat. in John 13th.

* Plat. in John 18th

* Plat. in Sylvest. 2.

* in vita Clem. 2. & Damas. 2.

* Onuphr. in vita Alex. 6.

the Eſſentialls of a true Election may be wanting? oft times the Elections were not free, either the Electors were over-awed, or their votes bought: and can we believe it is yet better? It is *Platina's* wiſh (when he ſaw how men were prefer'd to the Papacy, not for their piety, but for their gifts) *Quem morem utinam aliquando non retinuiſſent noſtra tempora*; but he rather feares unleſſe God prevented, that the elections would be worſe, *ſed hoc parum eſt pejora (ni deus caveat) aliquando viſuri ſumus:* although the doores of the *Conclave* are kept ſhut, yet enough flyes abroad to ſhew the *factions ſidings*, and *Pollicies* within, how the Cardinalls are devided by their *Intereſts*, and *dependencies* on Princes; how ſome are *frighted*, others *corrupted*; ſome out of *feare*, others out of *hatred* &c. giving their *Votes* this way, or that way; and what certainty can wee have this is a true Biſhop of *Rome*, lawful ſucceſſor to Saint *Peter* when we ſee ſo much ground to ſuſpect

pect that the Eſſentials of a true election are oft times wanting but if any reply, that Gods providence will not permit any to paſs for Pope, who is not Pope; and that if the Church doe ſubmit to him as *Pope*, it is certain that he is Pope, and pro. we may ſtil believe that it is *de fide* that this *Pope* is lawful elected *Pope*. But this is ſaying without proving, much confidence with little reaſon: I therefore add, that there have been thoſe who paſſed for Biſhops of *Rome* and have been owned not only by their owne partyes, as in a *Schiſme*, but generally have paſſed for the true Pope, when yet their Elections were null; I ſay, have been generally owned, their names reckoned in the catalogue, their decrees allowed, and yet the *Eſſentialls* requiſite to a right election are acknowledged by their owne *Hiſtorians* to be wanting. Inſtance in *Vigilius* the firſt who ſuborned witneſſes againſt *Silverius*, that he would betray the Citty to the *Gothes*, and having got

got him depoſed, was during the life of *Silverius* put into the Biſhoprick, and did (as *Onuphrius* confeſſeth) *Occupare per vim pontificatum Romanum*; and yet this man is owned for Pope, without the leaſt appearance of any new election after the death of *Sylverius*, or any approbation and allowance from the clergy, and people by which he might lawfully enjoy that title. Again I inſtance in *Benedict* the fifth created *Pope* in a *ſedition* by the friends and dependents of *Iohn* the thirteenth againſt *Leo* the eighth and yet he is both reckoned in the catalogue of *Popes*, and the ſucceeding *Popes* who aſſumed that name in reckoning of themſelves did allow him to be *Pope*; ſo in *Iohn* eighteenth though he came not in by the door, but during the life of *Gregory* the fifth ſeized on the Popedome, yet he is reckoned in the Catalogue of *Popes* which *Platina* admires*. When we thus ſee ſome owned for Popes who have never been duly elected, and

* *Annot. in Plat. in Vita Vigil. 1.*

* Onuph. *Annot. in vita Bened. 5.*

* *Plat. in vita John 18.*

and do know how much tirannical compulſion may force an outward compliance, we cannot judge the ſubmiſſion and ſilence of the Church (as *Suarez* holds) Can be any certain ground that the election was lawful. The ſum of this argument is this, if it be uncertain whether the *eſſentialls* of a juſt and true election be performed, then it is vncertain whether this be a true Pope and *ex conſequenti* it cannot be *de fide* that this Pope is the true ſucceſſor of Saint *Peter*. *ſecondly* we cannot be certain abſolutely that the things eſſentially required in the conſecration of the Pope are duly performed; I do not mean of ſuch things in the conſecration which are only required by the cannon; but I ſpeak of thoſe things which they account eſſential, that there can be no conſecration without them. *firſt* I inſtance in the *qualification*, of the perſon to be conſecrated: without baptiſme there is no ordination and *pro.* who have not been baptized cannot be ordained

ed, nor consecrated, and are *jure divino* uncapable of orders, but we cannot be absolutly certain that this person hath been baptized *pro.* we cannot be absolutly certain that some thing essential to his consecration is not wanting. *Secondly* In the *intention* of the consecrators, for that is essentially necessary in conferring of orders by the Councells of *Florence* * and the council of *Trent* * requires an intention of doing, that which the Church doth, but it may fall out, that the consecrators have no intention of doing any such things either through negligence, or malice either they may intend to do nothing or not to do that which the church doth (*i. e.*) to consecrate: or they may intend to do this outward act in sport or merriment, or if then they cannot be certain that there is either an actuall or virtuall intention in the consecrators, then they cannot be certain absolutly that the essentialls of consecration are duly performed.

* *Decret. de Sacram.*
* *Sess. de Sacram. Can. 2.*

Thirdly,

Thirdly. Without *intention* in the perſon to be conſecrated, there is no true conſecration; ſo *Innocent* the *third determines* * ; and *Suarez* call's it the common opinion of Divines that to the value of a ſacrament is required *intentio ſuſcipientis*; but no man can be abſolutly certain, that the *Pope* either in any moment foregoing or during the act of conſecration, did any way intend to receive it; for ti's not the bare outward performing or doing, or receving which are required: but the intending in the mind to do, or receive, and of that inward intention in the mind we cannot be certain. Many more things might be added concerning the conſecrators whether they were *baptized*? whether they were *Prieſts*? whether there is no *defect* in any thing eſſentially required to their baptiſme, or ordination? whether the intention in the conſecration was directed to that preſent perſon? for that *Fillucius* * requires now in theſe things ſince ti's Poſſible ſome eſſential

* *C. majores Extra. de Baptiſmo.*

* *Caſ. Conſc. tract. 1. c. 5. n. 79.*

may be wanting, it follows no man can be certain absolutly that this is the true *Pope*, and if he cannot be so absolutly certain that this is the true *Pope*: because ti's possible some essential has been wanting, then he cannot own it to be so *de fide*, nor swear that the Church of *Rome* is the Mother and Mistress of all Churches because of its Union with him.

Secondly, I instance in the Article of *Transubstantiation* according to the Creed of *Pius* 4th, they swear *that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially the body, and blood, with the Soul, and Deity, of our Lord Jesus Christ, and there is a conversion of the whole substance of bread into the body, and of the whole substance of wine into the blood*, which Conversion the Catholick Church calls Transubstantiation; and in the Council of *Trent* there is an *Anathema* pronounced against those who shall deny that wonderfull, and singular conversion of the

the whole ſubſtance of the bread into the body, and of the whole ſubſtance of the wine into the blood, the *Species* of bread, and wine onely remaining, which Converſion the Catholick Church moſt fitly calls Tranſubſtantiation: now though according to the Letter the Decree ſeems plain, and they will all cry up this wonderfull miracle, this *Auguſt* miſtery, yet in the explication of it and of the grounds whereupon they believe it they are perplexed; For,

Firſt, although they pretend to derive this Doctrine from Scripture, yet it is not certain that there is any place of Scripture which neceſſarily infers this doctrine: ſo *Scotus* * ſaies, and how the body of Chriſt is there, whether by Converſion of ſomething into it, or without Converſion the ſubſtance, and accidents of bread remaining, *non invenitur in Canone Bibliæ* ſaies *Gabriel Biel* †, and notwithſtanding that they uſually inſiſt on the 6th of St. *John* and the words of Inſtitution, this is my body, yet

* *In 4. lib. ſent. diſt. 11. q. 3.*

† *In Canone miſſ. lect. 40.*

others of great note among them, conclude that it is not expreſt in Scripture, ſo *Canus** holds, and *Cajetane* maintains† the 6th of St. *John* no way pertains to a Sacramental eating; the ſame is held by *Janſenius Tapperus* and others, cited by *Suarez* and firſt ſome of them confeſs, they ſhould not have believed it, unleſs the Church had declared it to be *de fide*, for the Church by the ſpirit of truth did explain thoſe things which were obſcure in Scripture*; but then it would be ſtill in vain to endeavour to prove this converſion from Scripture, becauſe there is no argument from thence which can ſufficiently convince: and to argue with us from thoſe Texts, which they think are not ſufficiently cogent without their Churches explanation, is altogether impertinent, for we are as uncertain of the infallibility of their Church in explaining thoſe Texts, as we are whether thoſe Doctrines be contained there, 'tis firſt as to us uncertain whether this Doctrine

*Loc. Com. l. 3. c. 3. fund. 2.

†In 3. part. q. 80. art. vlt.

* Canus Loc. Com. l. 3. c. 3. fundam. 2.

Doctrine be delivered in Scripture. *Secondly*, though they affirm that by the words of inſtitution the bread is turned into the body, and the wine into the blood, yet they are perplexed about the meaning of them. *Firſt*, As whether there be any *figure* in the words or no? For if they be conſtrued figuratively, then they cannot certainly infer any tranſubſtantiation; and firſt ſometimes they tell us there is no *figure*, or *trope:* yea, there ought to be none in the words of Inſtitution; but then how can the *Cup* be the *New Teſtament?* there the Cup muſt be put for *Wine* in the Cup. Again, How can the Cup be the New Teſtament properly? For a Teſtament is the Teſtators diſpoſition of his Eſtate; but the Wine in the Cup, or the thing contained under the *ſpecies* cannot be ſo in any proper ſenſe. Again, 'tis uncertain how the *blood* in the Cup can properly be called the *New Teſtament in his blood?* for the blood is a *phyſical*, a Teſtament is a *moral*

thing: yea 'tis uncertain whether *Bellarmin's* * Explanation of the words be ſenſe; *This blood under the ſpecies, is the New Teſtament under his blood:* ſo that 'tis doubtful when they have done all they can, whether they can explain theſe words without a *figure*. *Secondly*, They are perplexed about the meaning of theſe words, as what is meant by *hoc eſt corpus meum*; for if they cannot reſolve what is meant by this *Pronoun hoc*, then they cannot determine what is the full meaning of this *Propoſition*; indeed *Bellarmin** tels us, *Vera eſt Catholicorum ſententia, qui volunt illud* [*Hoc*] *non demonſtrare panem, ſed rem contentam ſub ſpeciebus panis*, &c. That the opinion of Catholicks was true, who ſay, this Pronoun *Hoc* doth demonſtrate not the Bread, but a thing contained under it; which although it was Bread before, yet it is now the Body of Chriſt: But he that conſults the *Romiſh* Writers, will find that *Bellarmin* only hides their quarrels, and obtrudes his own opinion for a general

L. 1. de Euchariſt. c. 11.

* L. 1. de Euchar. c. 10.

general Doctrine. *Johannes de Rhada* * acknowledges the perplexity of their Doctors; some say the Pronoun *Hoc* demonstrates the *species* of bread, because the Pronoun must signifie a *sensible* thing, which exists when the designation is made, and remains when the signification of the word is finished; but there is nothing in the Sacrament which is sensible when the words began to be pronounced, and when they are ended besides the *accidents*, first it must signifie the *Accidents*. Some say that this Pronoun demonstrates the body of Christ as it is in it self, or intending the body of Christ in Heaven, which when the words are spoken begin to be in the *Host* *; and so the words signifie, *this body is my body*. Some say, it designs the substance of bread under those accidents, and so the sense is, *The bread passes into the body of Christ; hoc est* *, *ad hujus verbi prolationem hoc totum transire in corpus*. Some say, *it designs something common to the substance of bread, and*

* *Controv. 5. de Sacr. Euchar. Art. 4.*

* Occam *quod lib. vit. q. 2.*

* Bonavent. *q. 1. Art 1. in 2 part. dist. 8. lib. 4.*

the Body of Christ under this reason of being contained under the species, and so the sense should be *hoc quod sub his accciden̄tibus continetur est corpus meum*, that which is contained under these accidents is my body, and this he pretends both *Thomas*, and *Scotus* holds. But still the perplexity remains, what that is which is contained under these *accidents*, when they first say *Hoc*; for 'tis not the *body* till the words are ended. If it were the *bread*, then the *Proposition* is true, *this bread is my body*; and that they will not grant. Again, the *subject* of the Proposition must have a distinct sense; when first our Saviour took the bread into his hand, and said *this is*, there must be some meaning of that part of the Proposition, that Demonstrative pronoun [*Hoc*] must refer to some thing present *, and that which is evident to the *senses*, and not barely apprehended by the *imagination*; what can that be but only *bread*? which they confess was existing during the speaking of the words?

* Bellar. *l.* 1. *de Sacr. Euchar. c.* 11. *§ hac expl.*

Thirdly,

Thirdly, they are perplexed, whether this Tranſubſtantiation be wrought by the Prayer of Conſecration, or the words of Inſtitution: that it was wrought by the Prayer, as well as the words was the opinion of ſome; that the Conſecration was the ſame with the bleſſing, and giving of thanks was the opinion of *Thomas Durand*, *Hugo Cardinalis*, &c. yet ſtill how this can be is wholly intricate and perplexed; for if our Saviour Conſecrated by bleſſing, and giving of thanks, then he conſecrated by Prayer: but that they will not ſay, for they now conclude he Conſecrated by thoſe words, *hoc eſt corpus meum*, as it is determined by the Council of *Florence* *, that our Saviours words by which he made the *Sacrament* are the *form* of it, and that by the virtue of thoſe words the Conſecration is wrought, and ſo it is explained in the *Roman* Catechiſme: *We are taught* (ſaies the Catechiſme) *by the Evangeliſts Mathew, and Luke, and by the Apoſtle*

* *Conc. Flor. in Inſtruct. Armen.*

ſile this is the form of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt; *hoc eſt corpus meum*: well, but ſtill they are perplexed in what ſenſe the Prieſt uſes theſe words; for ſome think they are only repeated *Hiſtorically* *; but they cannot work this change, for ſo they only ſhew what was done by our Saviour in the firſt celebration of the Sacrament; others ſay, that they are ſpoken *ſignificatively*, (*i. e.*) that the Prieſt ſpeaking in the perſon of Chriſt ſignifies the turning of that bread into the body, ſo ſaies the *Florentine* Council, *Sacerdos loquens in perſona Chriſti hoc conficit Sacramentum*; but this will not agree with the Canon of the *Maſs*, where they are repeated Hiſtorically, for after the Prayer *that God would make that offering to be to us the body, and blood of his Son Jeſus Chriſt*, 'tis immediately added in imitation of the *Apoſtles* recital of the Story, *who, the day before he ſuffered tooke bread into his holy and venerable hands, and lifting up his eyes unto Heaven*

* Salmero *tract.* 13. *tom.* 9. Soto *Art* 5. *q.* 1. *diſt.* 11.

Heaven to thee his Father, God Almighty, gave thanks, he bleſſed, brake, and gave to his Diſciples, ſaying, take, eate, all of this, for this is my body: now what *connexion* can there be betwixt theſe latter words, and the former? unleſs they be joyned as part of the Hiſtory: or what ſenſe in the former words *he brake and gave to his Diſciples, ſaying, take eate all of this?* if they break off abruptly the repeating of the Story, and do not add theſe words, *hoc eſt corpus meum.* Thus they are perplexed on either hand, and firſt to avoid this intricacy they have diviſed a new way, that theſe words ſhould both be taken *recitativè*, and *ſignificativè*: both as part of the Story, and as the Prieſts words in the perſon of Chriſt by virtue of them turning the bread; but ſtill how can this be, that the ſame words ſhould be both a repetition of a former Story, and the production of the like effect? how is this intelligible that the ſame word without

out any variation should be used for these different purposes? both to relate what was done, and to work the same thing over again: and further in the *Consecration* of the blood 'tis added *qui pro vobis & pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum* *, which shall be shed for you, and for many for the remission of sins, now if these words be understood *significatively*, then they are utterly false, as *Durand* argued, because the body of Christ must suffer no more, nor the blood be shed: thus whether these words shall be taken *narratively*, or *significatively*, or *joyntly* their *Doctors* cannot agree; and are wholly perplexed to solve the difficulties, and yet maintain their Ground. *Fourthly*, they are perplexed whether this conversion be *productive* or *adductive* or *Conservative*; and so *Bellarmine* acknowledges, that though they agree there is a transubstantiation (*i.e.*) conversion of the bread into the body, and of the wine into the

* *Canon missæ in missali* Rom. Paris. 1631.

the blood for the authority of the Councils and Church; yet in the manner of explaining it they differ, for they find ſo many difficulties in ſtating the manner of this converſion, that though they maintain the decree in the termes of it yet they are perplexed to find the ſenſe, (*i.e.*) they profeſſe to believe tranſubſtantiation but when they come to tell us what they mean by it, they then confeſſe they believe they know not what. For *firſt*, If this converſion be *productive* then the body of Chriſt ſhould be made by theſe words, *hoc eſt eorpus meum*, but that which already hath it's being, cannot by that action receive it's being, for it is ſuppoſed to have its being before that action. Again, *Every new reall action muſt have a new reall terme but there can be here no new reall terme, becauſe the terme was præexiſting* as *Io. de Rhada* * *argues*; again *Albertinus* * urges this argument, *if the word doth produce the body, then the body of Chriſt did concurre as an inſtrument to*

* *In 4. lib. ſent. Con. 7. Art. 2. Concl. 3.*

* *Coroll. tom. 2. Cur. 3. dub. 3. concl. vinc. § 13.*

to the production of it selfe: but that is a contradiction, that the body should be made substantially by it self, for then it should be both before and after it self; before it self, for it is presupposed to that Action by which it should be produced after it self as it is made by that Action, and by this means the same thing would be both effect and cause in the same kind, (i.e.) the body of Christ would be the cause of the Action by which it was produced, and that Action is the causality or manner by which the body is produced. This way of Conversion *productive* they now dislike, though it most agree with the Letter of the Canons, for they say, the bread is substantially turned into the body of Christ*: they compare this to the turning of water into Wine, but the Wine was produced in that miracle: they have been used to say, the Priest in the Sacrament creates his Creator; yea Pope *Urban* in the *Roman* Council makes this his pretence against doing Homage to the

* *Conc. Rom. sub Nicol. 2. & Greg. 7.*

Laity

Laity for *Eccleſiaſtical* honours, becauſe it was *nimis execrabile, manus quæ in tantam eminentiam excreverint ut Deum cuncta creantem ſuo miniſterio creent*, &c. becauſe it was abominable, that thoſe hands which are advanced to that honour to create God who created all things ſhould be the Servants of thoſe hands which are daily defiled with obſcene infection: this way of production though it was not defined, yet was thus publiquely pleaded by a Pope in Council but is now rejected. *Secondly*, If this Converſion be *conſervative*, then it will be wholly unintelligible, for conſervation is the continuance of creation, or a continuance of that which already hath its being: either firſt they meant, that by the words of Conſecration was wrought a Conſervation of the body of Chriſt which was in heaven, or a conſervation of it under the Sacramental *ſpecies*: it cannot be meant that there is wrought a conſervation of it under the *ſpecies* unleſs there had

had been first an *action creandi*, for *it cannot be thought that a thing is conserved there where it is not supposed first to exist; but according to them, before these words the body did not exist there, so it could not be conserved there: nor can it be meant of a conservation of the body in Heaven, for conservation is the continuance of an Action, but here is a new Action, and a new dependence wrought by the force of the words of consecration*, as *Albertinus* argues *. This pretence of conservation hath few maintainers, first let us consider the third way which *Bellarmine* calls *communiorem & tutiorem viam*, the more common, and safe way of *Thomas*, and other grave Divines, I mean *adductive* conversion, (*i. e.*) by the words the body of Christ is not made to exist simply, but to exist under those *species*; that the bread ceases to be under those *accidents*, and the body begins to be under them: that the body succeeds to exist under those accidents not by having a new substance,

* Tom. 2. Corol. 3. dub. 3. n. 7.

ſtance, but only a new preſence: but here they are all together perplexed; ſor if it ſucceed here, where the bread was, it muſt either change place, or be produced, as *Thomas* inſtances in fire, *if it begin to be in the Houſe, where it was not before, either it muſt be brought in hither, or be generated here*, that it doth not change places is plain, for then it ſhould leave Heaven, when it was adduced under the ſpecies of bread on Earth: if they ſay it muſt be produced here, how can that be? how can it be produced and not have its being produced? or how can it be ſaid that the ſubſtance of bread is turned into the ſubſtance of the body, when no new ſubſtance is made, but only the ſubſtance exiſts in a different *ubi*? or that one ſubſtance paſſes into another, when the one onely ſucceeds the other? *or how ſhould it be the moſt perfect manner of Converſion as Bellarmine ſaies, when there is no change in the Nature of the body but only it is vailed under other*

accidents? when there is no new ſubſtance but only a new *preſence?* yea *Rhada* ſaies out of *Scotus**, *there is no proper change at all? or how can it be moſt fitly cal'd Tranſubſtantiation, yea properly, and conveniently* (as the Council of *Trent* ſaies) *when this converſion of the whole ſubſtance of bread into the whole ſubſtance of the body is no more then that the one exiſted where the other did? and the term* [*ad quem*] *of this converſion is not any ſubſtance but an accidentalis modus, a preſence where it was not before?* There are ſome other inventions, wherewith they labour to ſolve theſe perplexities, but what one thinks that he builds, another ſoon pulls down, and there be ſo many contrary opinions in ſtating this converſion, that 'tis eaſy to ſee, they could not ſatisfie others, who are ſo wholly unſatisfied themſelves: *Thirdly*, there are ſo many *intricacies* about the *ſpecies* themſelves, *where* they are ſubjected; what *Union* betwixt the body of Chriſt and thoſe

* *Part.* 4. *Cont.* 6. *Art.* 1. *Concl.* 3.

thoſe accidents, whether this body be an *Organical* body or no? when it *ceaſes* to be under the ſpecies, if there be no *ſubſtance* of bread what then is broken? what *chewed*? what *digeſted*? what is it which *nouriſhes*? what is it which *breeds worms*, &c? there are ſo many intricacies, that thoſe who ſtifly maintain this Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, know not how to winde themſelves out: I inſtance in ſome few things. *Firſt, what is it that is broken?* either the body or the ſpecies: it cannot be the body, for the body cannot be divided into parts; and firſt, to ſay that the body is broken, and chewed by the teeth, unleſs they be underſtood in a ſound ſenſe, *in majorem incides hæreſin quam ipſe habuit Berengarius*, ſaies the *Gloſs* *, and yet in theſe words *Berengarius* was forced to recant, *panem & vinum non ſolum eſſe Sacramentum, ſed verum corpus*, &c. *& in veritate manibus Sacerdotum frangi, fidelium dentibus atteri* †, that

* *Gloſs. in Can.* Bereng. *de Conſecr. diſt. 2.*

† *Can. ego* Berengarius.

the body was in truth held in the Prieſts hands, broken, and chewed with the teeth: which words ſaies *Serenus Creſſy*, are far from being juſtifiable, unleſs they be underſtood *Sacramentally* (*i. e.*) for the outward ſpecies, which yet he ſees cannot be, for it's ſaid *not only is a Sacrament, but the body, &c. and is in truth held in the Prieſts hand, broken and chewed*, and if it be ſo, then Pope *Nicholas* and the Council erred which preſcribed this *recantation*, and how will he ſwallow that? it cannot be the ſpecies, for no man can break or chew colour, or ſavour, or figure, &c. but only ſome ſubſtance. *Secondly*, what is it that nouriſhes? it is either the body or the ſpecies. *Firſt*, it cannot be the body; for the body of Chriſt cannot be turned into our bodies, otherwiſe Chriſts body could not be whole, for thouſands of men muſt have part of his body; *It is nouriſhment to us* (ſaies *Creſſy*) *but not after a Carnall manner*; But how can this be?

be? for if it be not nouriſhment after a Carnal manner, then it muſt be after a *Spiritual*, and how can our bodies be nouriſhed Spiritually? *If there be nouriſhment, there muſt be ſomething digeſted, but Chriſts body is not turned into our bodies by digeſtion*, ſaies he: *If there be nouriſhment, then ſomething muſt be added to our bodies but Chriſts body is not added to our bodies*: Let him firſt either ſhew how bodies can be nouriſhed Spiritually, or confeſs that he ſpeaks, what he doth not underſtand. Some firſt among them ſay, *The body ceaſes to be under the ſpecies when it comes into the belly*, others ſay, *while it is in the mouth*; others, *that while the ſpecies remains the body remains*; and firſt while the ſpecies are in the belly, the body of Chriſt is there*, but the *Gloſs* on the Canon *non iſte de conſecrat. diſtinct.* 2. ſaies, the body doth not come down into the belly, *quouſque verò pergulam procedat neſcio*; how far it goeth into the Throat I know not; yet

* Lindwood *in Conſt. prov. de ſum. trin. cal-tiſſ. p. glutiant.*

he concludeth, *'tis not digeſted as other meats are, nor paſſes into the nouriſhment of the body, for it is the food of the Soul, and not of the body:* Well, can it be the ſpecies? Secondly, that alſo is uncertain for nouriſhing is the reparation of a ſubſtance, not of accidents, and firſt muſt be by a ſubſtance, and not barely by accidents: in nouriſhing the food muſt be tranſmuted into the body, and how can accidents be ſo? to ſalve all this, God muſt afford ſome matter, either reſtore the former matter of bread, or produce ſome new matter, or which is moſt miraculous to me, *all this muſt be done without a miracle ſaies Bellarmine* *; *for the Naturall Order of things require it, (i.e.) when the diſpoſitions requiſite for introducing the form are made, after the previous alteration of the ſpecies, then the order of things requiring it, God muſt ſubſtitute matter*: but what aſſurance hath *Bellarmine* that all theſe things ſhall be as he fancies? that the

* L. 3. *de Euchar.* c. 24. *reſp. ad arg.* 6.

the accidents ſhall be diſpoſed without matter, in which they ſhould be ſubjected? that when theſe material diſpoſitions are perfected God will ſubſtitute matter: many ſuch things there are which will trouble him to reſolve. All this ſhews that this is a moſt perplexed Doctrine, for if the ſubſtance of bread be gone, what can nouriſh? it muſt either be the body or the ſpecies; and yet neither of theſe can they certainly fix on. Thirdly, what is it that is corrupted? as when worms are generated of the *Hoſt*, it cannot be the body, *for God will not ſuffer his holy one to ſee Corruption.* If they ſay the ſpecies, neither can that be, for Corruption is properly of ſubſtance, neither can the worms be generated of bare accidents, as of colour, figure, or the like, there muſt be then ſome new matter created into which the form of worms muſt be introduced, and how ſtrange muſt this be? that men to free themſelves from theſe per-

plexities are forced to shelter themselves under pretence of multitude of miracles of which not one can be perceived by our senses. *Durand* mentions *eleven* miracles in Transubstantiation*, and yet there is not the least appearance to our senses that there is one; yea to clear themselves from the perplexities which attend this Doctrine they are forced to fly to more, *Thomas Aquinas* †, saies there are *plura difficiliora*, &c. more difficulties than in the creation. And *Scotus* ‖ objects to himself, that this one opinion is the occasion of turning all Philosophers, and those that follow Natural reason from the faith, for they would think, that there are greater inconveniencies (supposing there be no substance of bread remaining) than in the article of the Incarnation, *& propter hæc fidem patere contemptui omnium sequentium rationem*; this exposes Religion to the contempt of all that follow reason: for to believe that which seems so much

* *Rationale div. offic. l. 4. c. 12.*

† *Part. 3. q. 75. art. 8. arg. 3.*

‖ *In 4. lib. sentent. dist. 11. q. 3.*

much both againſt ſenſe and reaſon, and ſo little appearance of revelation to defend it, is ſtrange to wiſe, and rational men, who know not how to digeſt ſuch uncertain, doubtful, and abſur'd opinions, unleſs they can bring their faith to believe what they judge impoſſible. The ſum of this ſecond argument to prove the perplexities of the *Romiſh* Church in the Doctrines ſhe hath defined is taken from the uncertainties, intricacies, and perplexities in the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation.

Thirdly, I inſtance in the Doctrine of *Invocation of Saints*, the Council of *Trent* * commands all who have any cure to teach this, *That the Saints reigning with Chriſt offer up their Prayers for men to God: that it is good and profitable, humbly to invoke them, and for the benefits to be obtained of God by his Son, who is our only Redeemer, and Saviour, to fly to their Prayers, help, and aid,* and

* *Seſſ. 25. de Invocatione*, &c.

and it declares, *that all those think impiously, who deny that the Saints enjoying Eternal happiness are to be invoked; or who assert that they do not pray for men; or that it is fooliſh to ſupplicate to them, either with the voice, or the mind:* Now this Doctrine is ſo dubious, that it is unreaſonable to make it an article of faith. for firſt though the Saints ſhould pray for us, yet 'tis no neceſſary inference, firſt we muſt pray to them: no more then if a friend at an hundred miles diſtance ſhould every day pray for us, firſt we muſt every day ſay at that diſtance, *ora pro nobis.* Secondly, it is no way certain that it is good, and profitable to fly to their Prayers, help, and aide, for if it be not certain that they know our Prayers, it is not certain that it is profitable to fly to their prayers; now if they know them it muſt be either that they hear theſe themſelves, or are revealed to them by God, or diſcover'd to them by the holy *Angels.* But firſt, it is not certain that they

they themſelves can heare them; for though according to *Scotus* ſeperat ſouls may intuitively ſee every vocal oration which they might have known if they were joyned to the body, and alſo mental orations, and may behold the eſſence, and internal operation of our ſouls, yet all this muſt be underſtood *niſi immoderata diſtantia impediat*, * vnleſs there be an immoderate diſtance, for no Agent can act but upon a patient duly approximated to it, and an immoderate diſtance hinders the approximation: firſt unleſs the Seperate Soul be in its due diſtance, it cannot underſtand theſe Prayers: and ſo *Biel*† Sayes *that they cannot know, that way, either mental or vocal Prayers by reaſon of the immoderate diſtance*: ſuppoſing (I ſay) with *Scotus*, that ſeperate Souls may hear thoſe Prayers, which they might have known, when they were joyned to the body: yet this is not certain how far this diſtance reaches; and what is the

* Io. de Rhada. *Cont.* 16. *Art.* 4. *Concl.* 1.

† *In Canon Miſſæ Lect.* 31.

the Sphear of their activity; and 'tis far less certain, whether the Saints in Heaven can at that distance hear the many suppliants in several parts of the Earth; and see those secret desires which never discover'd themselves in words. Secondly, it is no way certain that the Prayers of men are discover'd by the Angels to the Saints, for it is not certain, that the Angels can know the thoughts *; or if they do, 'tis not certain that they do discover these things to them. 'Tis not certain they do know them, yea its most certain that God only knoweth them †, and if they do know them, yet 'tis not certain that they are either bound by Charity, or Office to represent these things to the Saints. Thirdly, the usual way they pitch on is either Gods revelation to the Saints as he reveal'ed things which were future to the Prophets: or else that the Saints see all things in God from the begining of their happiness, which any way pertain to them: and this

* Bellar. lib. 1. de Sanct. Beatit. c. 20.

† 2 Chro. 6. 30.

way

way *Bellarmine* calls the more profitable opinion, but neither of these waies is certain. For first, 'tis no way certain that God doth reveal these Prayers to the Saints, which are made to them. And if he should as *Bellarmine* argues, the Church could not so confidently say to the Saints, *Pray for us*, as rather, *Pray to God that he would reveal these Prayers to them*; no man can say, that God is any way bound to reveal these things, or *de facto* that he doth so, and how then can we be certain that God will reveal these Prayers to them. Secondly, 'tis not certain that they see these things in the word, as in a Corporeal Glass men may see clearly and distinctly what appears, according to *Becanus** his explication. For first, 'tis no way necessary to the Saints happiness, that they should see these things in God, neither from the nature of happiness, because as *Scotus* and his followers argue, *the proper nature of Happiness consists in seeing God, and his*

* *Man. contr. l. 1. c. 8. §. 4.*

his Attributes, but the Prayers of Saints are distinct from God, and his Attributes, first 'tis not necessary they should see these, ex ratione beatitudinis *; nor is it a consequent flowing from their happiness, that because they may see in his Essence those things which flow from his Essence, first they may see the Prayers made by the Creatures: though they may see his works about the Creature, I mean the *Idea* of his works which is himself, yet it doth not follow, they should see whatever the Creature himself doth: and so *Biel* tells us *that it is no part of their Essential beatitude, nor is it certain that it pertains to their accidental beatitude* †. Secondly, as it is not necessary they should, so it is not certain, that they do see all things in the Glass of the Divine Essence: for either then they see all things simply in that Glass, or only such things as God is pleased to permit them to see; if all things simply, then they must needs know all future contingencies,

* *Rhoda Cons.* 16. *Art.* 4. *Concl.* 3.

† Biel *in Canon Missa Lect.* 31.

tingencies, they must know the day, and hour when the Son shall come to judge the world, and yet our Saviour saith, of that hour knoweth no man, no not the Angels, though they alwaies see the face of their Father who is in Heaven *: If they see such things only as God is pleased to discover to them, then we cannot be certain that they know our prayers, unless we are first certain that God will discover them to them: If this Glass they talke of discovers all things *tanquam per naturalem communicationem*, then they must see all future contingencies, if the Glass discovers things only *tanquam per voluntariam communicationem*, then they know no more then he is pleased to communicate, and without his revelation we cannot be certain what that is, which he doth communicate: and if we cannot be certain they know our Prayers, we cannot be certain that it is profitable to fly to their Prayers. Thirdly, it is no way *certain* that they

* Matt. 18. 10.

they *Pray* for us, I confeſs it is not *incredible* that they Pray for their fellow members; none will deny that their Charity is more ardent in Heaven, then it was on Earth, and the greater their Charity is it will appear in more eminent effects (ſo far as their conditiou permits) to their Brethren. Thus far we do not queſtion whether they pray for us, I mean *in genere**; yea, what if I ſhould add that it is not *incredible*, but that they pray for their friends and acquaintance? and in general deſire the removal of Evils, and the granting thoſe things which are neceſſary for their Salvation? yea, if I ſhould add further that it is not *incredible*, but that they pray for them whoſe Conditions on Earth they remember, even this alſo ſome eminent *Proteſtants* have thought†: yet ſtill 'tis no way certain, not certain (I ſay) that they do pray in particular for their fellow members, or remember in their Prayers all the particular neceſſities of the faithfull on

* Field *of the Church l.3.c.3.*

† Andrews *Opuſc. Poſth. Reſp. ad c.20.l.5. Repl. Card.* Perron Montac. *adv.* Buleng. *pag.* 21.

on earth: for if we ſay we are certain that they do thus particularly pray, the queſtion will return which way? or by what ground are we certainly aſſured? and it will apear there is no certain ground but only ſome gueſſes, and ſuppoſed probabilities, and p⁀. this Doctrine muſt be doubtful, and uncertain.

Fourthly, I inſtance in the Doctrine of *Indulgences*, the Councel of *Trent* declares, *That ſince there was a power of beſtowing Indulgences granted by Chriſt to the Church, and the Church from the moſt ancient times hath uſed it: The Synod doth teach, that the uſe of them being very wholſome to Chriſtian people and approved by authority of Councils to be retained in the Church: and Anathematizes them who either ſay they are unprofitable, or deny the Churches power to beſtow them.* The ſame alſo is ſworn by their Clergy in the profeſſion of faith made by *Pius* 4. *Indul-*

gentiarum Potestatem à Christo in Ecclesia relictam esse, illarúmque usum Christiano Populo maxime salutarem esse affirmo. No more was said of this Article by the Council of *Trent*, whether for hast of ending the Council: or rather for multiplicity of abstruse questions, which must have been determined as the History of the Council sayes, I cannot judge. The meaning of the *article* must be gathered from the practice of their Church and opinion of their *Doctors*: tis certain in the practice of their Church that there are indulgences granted by the *Pope* in which he doth absolve *à culpa et pœna* both from fault, and punishment. That for visiting such a *Church* frequenting such a *Station*, Saying over at such an *Altar* so many times *Ave Maria* or *Pater noster*, they shall have *plenam remissionem peccatorum*, so it is in the *Bul* of indulgence for celebrating the year of *Jubilee*; in the first institution of Jubilees by *Boniface* the 8th.* he gave to those who visited the

* Platina *in vit. Bonifac. 8.*

the threſholds of the Apoſtles *plenam omnium peccatorum remiſſionem* a full remiſſion of all ſins. *Leo* the 10th gave to thoſe who devoutly repeated this *Prayer* after the divine *Office*, (to the holy, and undivided *Trinity*, the *humanity* of Chriſt Crucified, the fruitful integrity of the moſt bleſſed *Virgin* be eternal praiſe, glory, and honor) Indulgence of all the defects, and faults which in the performance of the office were contracted by humane frailty. * Nothing is more common in the Buls for the *Cruſadoes* then pardon for half ſins, or for all ſins, ſo in the Cruſado, which *Urban* the 6th publiſht againſt the adherents of *Clement* there were given to *Henry Spenſer* Biſhop of *Norwich mirabiles indulgentiæ*,* by the authority of which he did abſolve as well the dead as the living, for whom there was a ſufficient contribution from all the fault and puniſhment: and ſome of his *Commiſſaries* affirmed, that at their command the Angels deſcended from Heaven,

* Gavant *Theſ. Sacr. Rit. in. Fine Libri.*

† Hen. Knighton *Cron. l. 5 inter ſcript. Hiſt. Anglic. Pag. 2671.*

and took the ſouls which were in *Purgatory*, out of their puniſhment, and inſtantly carried them to Heaven. In the Cruſadoes againſt the *Albigenſes*, *Innocent* promiſed to all, who either died in the way or in battel, on Gods part and by the authority of St. *Peter* aud St. *Paul* abſolution from all the ſins contracted in their lives, which they had confeſt, and for which they had not done *penance**. Sometimes the indulgence runs for *penance* injoyned; ſo for repeating the new office of the *Bleſſed Virgin* if they be not obliged to do it, *Pius* 5 remits 50 days *de pœnitentiis injunctis*, as oft as they do it: for repeating the office of the dead, for repeating the 7 *penitential* pſalms, or the *Graduals* 40 days, and ſo the Indulgence runs which *Martin* the 50 anno 1429 gave for the Celebration of *Corpus Chriſti* day to all that were preſent at the *Mattins* and *Evenſong* of the feaſt 200 dayes indulgence, to all that were preſent at the *Prime*, the *third*, the *ſixth*, the *ninth*, or the

* Rigord. *Hiſt. An.* 1208 *Pag.* 207.

the *Completory* of that feast 80 days, to the Priests who said *Mass* for every Mass 100 days, to those who follow the procession in which the *Host* is carried 100 days, &c. to indure every year for ever. * Sometimes they are Indulgences *pro pœnitentiis injungendis*, for remission of Penance which might be enjoyned, sometimes the words run, *Indulgentiam in Domino misericorditer relaxamus*: and these Indulgences are some for daies; so every Arch Bishop and Bishop at their first coming to their *Cathedrals* * grant 40 daies: sometimes for one year as at the *dedication* of a Church, sometimes for 7, sometimes for an 100 years, sometimes for 1000. So the Monastery of *St. Sebastian in Catacumbis* hath Indulgences of 3000 years for all that visit a stone which hath the print of our Saviours footsteps: by other Popes 7000 years were granted on the feast of the *Ascention* unto the *Calends* of *August* every day 4000 years on St *Sebastians*

* Const. *Prov. Tit de ferlis g'oss. In Cap. Ex cript. p. Corp. Christi.*

† *Carem. Epsc. l. 1. c. 2.*

ſtians day 3000 years, and 40 days of Indulgence, and all theſe are doubled in *Lent* and in the double feſtivals. I could reckon up multitudes of large Indulgences, which ſome bountiful Popes have beſtowed, as at *Crowland* Abby a pardon of 8000 years: ſo the par-

† *Acts and Monum. in the life of* Cromwel. *Pag.* 49.

don procured by *Thomas Cromwel* † for *Boſton* from *Julius* the ſecond, that all who are of the gylde of our *Lady* in *St. Botolphs* Church in *Boſton* who reſort to the ſaid Chappel on the Nativity or Aſſumption of our *Lady*, giving to the ſupport of the Chappel at every ſuch feſtival, ſhall have full remiſſion of all his ſins: or if they could not come to that Chappel, yet if they ſaid at their Parriſh Church, one *Pater noſter*, and *Ave Maria*, they ſhould have like remiſſion, and thoſe that came every Fryday to that Chapel ſhould have as much remiſſion, as if they went to the Chappel cal'd *Scala Cæli*, &c. Or if their Popes are ſparing, yet their Prieſts aſſure men of greater bounty

for

for saying a prayer which begins *O Altissima Crux &c* they shall have as many years Indulgence as there is gravel in the sea, or grass on the ground. This is the practice of their Church, by which we may see the meaning of the *Article* the exposition of their Doctors reaches not so farr as the practice: for they tell us, Indulgence is the remission of temporal punishment *, or the remission of temporal punishment due by divine Judgment for actual sins, through the application of the superabundant satisfaction of Christ and the Saints, by him who hath power to dispence it: this Doctrine of Indulgences leans on 4 things. *First*, that after the remission of the fault and the eternal punishment, there is yet a temporal punishment due. *Secondly*, That a righteous man not onely satisfies for himselfe by his own merit, but may apply his own satisfaction to others. *Thirdly*, That there is a treasure in the Church made up of the superabundant me-

* *Summa. Angelica. P. Indulgentia.*

rits and satisfaction of Christ, and the Saints. *Fourthly*, That there is a power in the Church appointed by Christ to dispense this Treasure; or thus as others speak, there are temporal punishments left unremitted, though God pardon the eternal, that these punishments must be satisfied either in this life, or hereafter that the *Penances* imposed by the Priests are satisfactions for the punishment they should undergo, that a righteous person may by the superabundance of his own *Merit*, satisfy for that which ought to be performed by another, that there is a Treasure of those superabundant merits of Christ, and the Saints. *Lastly*, That there is a power to dispense this Treasure according as it shal seem fitting. Many things are necessary for the understanding of this Doctrine, and yet every thing in it perplexed and uncertain: I will instance in several things.

First, The value of them, if there can be no certainty by their Doctrine

ctrine that there is any profit by these Indulgences, then we have no reason to professe this to be an article of faith, but there is no certainty of any benifit by them. For *First*, If the Indulgences do *valere quantum sonat*, are as much worth as the words sound, then these Indulgences should remit the guilt of all sin. For many Indulgences tell us of a *remissio omnium peccatorum*, of a remission *à culpa & pœna*; and this Article *per passiones Sanctorum Indulgentiis Communicatas non propriè redimi peccata nostra*; that our sins are not properly redeemed by the passions of Saints Communicated by Indulgences, was condemned by *Leo* 10. and *Pius* 5. but now that they do not remit any is the common opinion, yea and is certain *de fide Suarez* * and *Filliucius* * attest. *Secondly*, It is not certain that they remit any punishment, for the eternal is already pardoned and there needs no farther Indulgence: and as for the temporal punishments,

* *Disp. 50. Sect. 1.*
* *Cas. Conscien. tract. 8. part. c. 7. n. 3180.*

nishments which (they say) remains. *First*, there are many temporal punishments due to the sinner, which are not taken away by the most plenary Indulgence. Suppose God should inflict a disease for the satisfaction of the temporal punishments remaining unpayed, they will then tell us that this Indulgence doth not take away natural punishment which God inflicts for actual sin, as the Plague which God brought upon the people for *Davids* sin. * *Secondly*, these Indulgences do not take away the punishment inflicted *in foro externo* whether Civil or Ecclesiastical, that's also granted by *Bellarmine* *. *Thirdly*, It it is not certain that they take away the punishments which may be injoyned by the ancient *Canons*; for as *Cajetan* argues, nothing can be taken away by the Indulgence, but what a man was bound to perform, but the punishments which are not enjoyned by the Judge no man is bound to perform p. for the punishments in the Canons are only taxed to

* Bellar. *de Indulgent. l.* 1. *c.* 7. *l.* 2. *c.* 7.

* Bellarm. *de Indulgent. ibid, &c.*

to be enjoyned by the Judge, &c. till they are actually enjoyned no man can be obliged to perform them. *Fourthly*, It is not certain that they take away all the punishment injoyned by the *Confessor* in the Court of Penance, for as *Valentia* * saies, *the Confessor is bound for the integrity of the Sacrament to injoyne, and the Penitent to performe wholsom Penance*, and if the Penitent is bound to perform those satisfactions, then the Indulgence doth not take them away. Againe *Bellarmine* saies, *this is the use of the Church that whosoever intend to get any Indulgences, are wont to confess, and perform the satisfactions injoyned*, but then to what profit serves the Indulgence, if it frees them only from those satisfactions which they have already fulfilled? they tell us further, *that we cannot be certain that we receive any benefit by the Indulgence, and &c. for greater merit, and security, we should perform the satisfactions injoyned; ob majus meritum & securitatem, neque*

* *Tract. de Indulg. Punct. 3.*

* Filliuc. *Caſ. conſc. Tract. 8. Part. 3. c. 7. n. 176.*

neque enim poteſt quis eſſe certus de Indulgentia percepta * and ſince no man can be certain that he receives any benefit by an Indulgence, &c. no wonder if he muſt for his own ſecurity indeavour to perform the ſatisfactions impoſed, and if he is ſtill bound to endeavour to perform them by himſelf, then it is not certain, that they take away the puniſhment injoyned. *Fifthly*, It is not certain that they take away the puniſhment due by the Judgment of God. Suppoſe there be a puniſhment due here, or to be inflicted in *Purgatory* hereafter, yet there is no certainty that theſe Indulgences take away this puniſhment. For, *firſt*, It is uncertain whether the power of the *Keyes* can extend further, than to take away that puniſhment, which it might inflict: but the power of the Keyes reaches not to inflict theſe puniſhments: *Secondly*, It is no way certain whether the Indulgence be valuable further, then according to the worthineſs, and

and devotion of him who receives the Indulgence, and then 'tis no way certain that there is any benefit by the Indulgence: *Angelus de Clavasio* * tells us that *quoad augmentum Gratiæ & Gloriæ*, they are onely so much worth as is the devotion of him that receives them, and no more: but in respect of the punishment which is to be inflicted in Purgatory, *tantum dimittit quantum sonat*, remitts what it expresses: but how comes the value of the Indulgence for the gaining an augmentation of Glory, to depend on the worth of the receiver, and not for gaining a freedome from paine? Again, the Indulgence requires they should be contrite, and have devoutly confessed their sins, and without this they gain no benefit by the Indulgence; but then what certainty whether any benefit come from the Indulgence, or rather that it comes from the Contrition of the Penitent, which also would availe without the Indulgence? others P. go further,

* *Summa. Angelica. P. Indulgentia.*

further, and tell us they are never so much worth as is promiſed, *ſed aliquid valent modicum, ſecundum quod mereter fides & devotio,* ſo *Bonaventure* ſaies * ſome held. Thus it is no way certain according to themſelves, what the real advantage is whether they bring any? and if it be no way certain, then we cannot be bound to profeſs this as an Article of our Faith, that Indulgences are wholeſome and profitable; Indeed I will allow them to be profitable, but 'tis to the Popes *purſe*, not to the Penitents *Soul:* you may read the advantage which Pope *Urban* the 6. made by the Indulgence publiſht in *England* 1382. *Henry Spenſer* Biſhop of *Norwich* gathered (ſaies *Henry Knighton* †) an incredible ſum of Gold and Silver and Jewels and Rings and Diſhes and Spoons and other Ornaments, ſpecially from Ladies and other women: and that both men and women gave not according, but even beyond their abilities, that their dead friends as well

* *In 4. Diſt. 21.*

† *Chron. Henry Knighton pag. 2671.*

as

as themſelves might receive the benefit of abſolution from their ſins, which none could obtain, unleſs they contributed according to their Eſtates.

Secondly, The matter of them, (*i.e.*) the *Superfluous* ſatisfactions of Chriſt and the Saints, which are reſerved in the *Treaſure* of the Church, for (ſay they) *there can be no remiſſion of puniſhments injoyned for ſins, unleſs there be ſome recompenſe made by ſome who have performed more then was due from them:* but if it be uncertain whether there be any ſuch Treaſure, then the Doctrine of Indulgences is uncertain. *Firſt*, 'Tis not certain that there is any ſuch Treaſure of the Saints ſatisfactions reſerved in the Church; *Firſt*, Becauſe 'tis not certain, that they have ſuffered more then they have deſerved.

Secondly, Though they ſhould ſuffer more then they have deſerved, yet 'tis not certain, that they do or can ſuffer more then they are bound

in

in obedience to God. *Thirdly*, 'Tis not certain, that if they do or suffer only, what they are bound in obedience to God, that they can satisfie by that obedience for another, for where they only pay that which is required of them there is nothing superfluous, and po. nothing to be put into the Treasure. *Fourthly*, 'Tis not certain, but their sufferings are as much or more rewarded, then is due or can be due to them; and if they are fully rewarded, then they cannot discharge another mans debt: and upon this ground *Franc. Mayronis*, and *Angel. de Clavasio* deny the satisfactions of the Saints can be put into the Treasure †.

* *Sum. Angelica. P. Indulgentia. N. 9.*

Secondly, 'Tis not *certain* that there is any treasure made up of the superfluous satisfactions of Christ, and his Church. For, *First*, If the Treasure of Christs satisfactions be infinite then it is not certain, that any thing can be added to it, for an infinite cannot be increased, otherwise there should be an infinite grea-

ter

ter than an infinite. *Secondly*, It is not certain, that there is any advantage by those satisfactions of the Saints, for if Christs merit be of an infinite value, then there is nothing that can be procured by the satisfactions of Saints, which hath not been allready procured by Christs merit: nor is there any thing we can gaine by the satisfactions of Saints but we may much more receive it from the infinite merit of Christ. If then we have no certainty, that there is any use of this Treasure, we can then have no certainty that there is any such Treasure. *Thirdly*, It is no way certain, that there is any such Treasure of the superfluous satisfactions of Christ; because, *first*, It is not certain, that any thing Christ did, or suffer'd, could be more than he was bound to undergo, as he became our *Surety* and in obedience to the command of his Father was bound to do, or suffer, what ever his Father required for the full satisfaction of his *Justice*; and if his

ſatisfactions were in this reſpect ne-ceſſary, then they cannot be call'd ſuperfluous. *Secondly*, Though his ſatisfaction was infinite, yet it is not certain, that any thing was ſuperfluous; becauſe all that a finite perſon can do or ſuffer, can never ſatisfie infinite Juſtice. And it is not certain, when the offender deſerves the utmoſt puiſhment both here, and hereafter which he is capable of undergoing, that every work or ſuffering, (though of an infinite perſon) can be ſufficiently ſatisfactory to expiate that debt. *Thirdly*, Though his ſatisfaction was ſufficient for more, then it was actually extended to, yet 'tis no more certain, that ſome ſatisfactions are ſuperfluous, than that the light of the *Sun* (which would enlighten thouſands more, than actually receive benefit by it) is ſo: or that Gods *Omnipotency* is ſuperfluous, becauſe it may create more worlds, than already are. *Laſtly*, This Doctrine contains many perplexities, and inſoluble ſcruples, as, which

which are neceſſary and which ſatiſfactions are ſuperfluous? what part of Chriſts ſatisfactions are rewarded? and what not? for thoſe which are allready rewarded cannot be put into the common ſtock; whether the ſame merit, which merited Glory for himſelf? or that which merited the pardon of Eternal puniſhment? or that there is ſome other merit which only merits the remiſſion of Temporal puniſhment? and how this merit diſtinguiſh't from the reſt is put into the Treaſure? theſe and many other perplexities are ſo interwoven in this Doctrine that their wiſeſt *Doctors* have not yet found out a way to extricate themſelves.

Thirdly, The authority diſpenſing theſe Indulgences (*i.e.*) The Council ſuppoſe this for granted that there was a power left to the Church of beſtowing theſe Indulgences, and the Church hath from all Antiquity uſed it: but if theſe things be uncertain, then we have

no reaſon to own this Doctrine. *Firſt*, I ſay there is no Certainty, that Chriſt left this power to the Church, they tell us, that the Pope onely hath power of beſtowing thoſe Indulgences *Jure Divino*: Biſhops and other Prelates *Jure humano*: that the Pope may grant plenary Indulgences*, and over all the world: that his power is founded in theſe words, *what ever thou looſeſt on earth ſhall be looſed in Heaven*; and on that text *feed my Sheep* in which is included all acts of Juriſdiction, which any way conduce to ſhut or open the Kingdome of Heaven, and of this ſort is remiſſion of puniſhment by theſe Indulgences; † but this is wholy uncertain, and founded rather on meere gueſſes, than on a rational ground: For,

* *Sum. Angel. ca. 161. n. 5.*

† *Filliuc. Caſ. Conſc. Tract. 8. part. 3. n. 62.*

Firſt, It is not certain that he who can remit the Eternal puniſhment, (as they tell us the Prieſt doth in the Sacrament of penance) cannot alſo remit the Temporal puniſhment: becauſe he who can do the

the greater, regularly) unleſs there be ſome reſtraint) can do the leſs. *Secondly*, It is not certain, that the Pope hath any power of granting theſe Indulgences from thoſe texts, for it's neither expreſt in the texts, nor gathered thence by ancient *Interpreters*, nor is it evident by fair conſequence.

Secondly, It is not certain, that the Church hath uſed them from all *antiquity*, for where will they find the Popes *divine* right of granting Indulgences. That theſe Indulgences were remiſſions of temporal puniſhment due to God? that by the remiſſion of theſe puniſhments here ſo much was abated as they muſt indure in this life or in Purgatory; that there were Indulgences for 100, or 1000, of yeares? that for repeating a Prayer over hallowed *Beads* viſiting ſuch an *Altar* praying before ſuch an *Image!* there ſhould be granted an Indulgence *toties quoties*, either of all, or halfe or third part of their ſins? as many Buls of modern

*Opuſc. 15. t. 1.

Popes ſpeak: and Po. *Cajetane** will tel us that neither the Holy Scripture nor the writings of the ancient *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers brought this to our knowledge, but only à 300 annis *Scripturæ Commendatum eſt de veteribus patribus, quod Beatus Gregorius Indulgentias Stationum inſtituit:* it was Committed to writing about 300 years ago, concerning the ancient Fathers, that St. *Gregory* ordained the Indulgences of the *Stations*: ſome tell us there are no manifeſt Teſtimonies before St. *Gregorys* time, yet we muſt believe (though we have no ground for it I warrant you) ſaies *Angelus de Clavaſio* that they were in uſe before: others confeſs, *there is nothing the Scripture doth leſs plainly deliver, or the ancient Fathers leſs mention*, ſo *Alphonſus de Caſtro: that they began when Charity leſſned, and ſin increaſed*, ſay others; yea ſome will not believe, becauſe the uſe of them ſeems to be late, and lately found out among the Chriſtians, ſaies *Roffenſis*

Roffenſis *, and all he Anſwers, is this, that there was ſome uſe (as they ſay) among the ancient *Romans* and that many things are now found out more plainly, out of the Goſpels, and other Scriptures than were heretofore: if thus they are not agreed who wrote before the Council, concerning the Antiquity of them, nor are there any evident Teſtimonies in the *Fathers* or ancient Writers of ſuch uſe of Indulgences, as they now practice, it is then not certain that the Church hath from all Antiquity uſed them, and ſo. I have no reaſon to aſſent to this Doctrine of Indulgences delivered by the Council.

* *Ad Art.* 18.

This is my firſt Argument to diſſwade from reunion with the preſent Romiſh Church, becauſe many of their Doctrines, which they require to be believed as Articles of Faith, are uncertain and doubtfull.

CHAP. II.

THe ſecond *Conſideration* is drawn from the *Ceremonies* of the *Romiſh* Church: It is unreaſonable to adhere to that Church which commands us *firmly* to embrace thoſe for *Apoſtolical* rites, which are altogether queſtionable, and dubious: and thoſe for pious, and good, which it is doubtfull, whether they be not vain, rediculous, and ſuperſtitious: but the *Romiſh* Church commands this: Po. In the Creed of *Pius* 4. it is required, *That they ſhould moſt firmly admit, and embrace the Apoſtolical, and Eccleſiaſtical Traditions, and other obſervations of that Church*, and afterwards, *that they receive, and admit the approved rites of Catholick* (as they call the *Roman Church*) *in the ſolemn adminiſtration of the ſeven Sacraments*: and its declared by the Council, *that the Church hath uſed in the Sacrifice of the Maſs*

ceremonies

ceremonies as miſtical, bleſſings, Lights, Inceníe, Garments, and many other things from Apoſtolical Diſcipline and Tradition. But many things which they affirm to be Apoſtolical are at beſt uncertain, and many things which they require thus firmly to be believed are vain, and fooliſh, and cannot be excuſed from all ſuperſtition.

Firſt, It is uncertain, that many of thoſe ceremonies which they uſe in the Maſs are of Apoſtolical Diſcipline, and Tradition as they pretend. *Firſt*, There is no certainty that their miſtical bleſſings are delivered down from the *Apoſtles*, for though we are bound to receive the creatures with thanksgiving, and by prayer to God they are bleſſed for that uſe which he hath appointed, yet it is uncertain whether the Apoſtles did leave this Tradition, that certain things ſhould be bleſſed by prayer, and the ſigne of the *Croſs* to work ſupernatural effects, as to cure diſeaſes, and drive away Devils, and

remit

remit venial sins, which things *Bellarmin* * makes the effect of these benedictions. In the blessing of the wax lights on Easter eve (this must be done by a *Deacon*, and he must put five grains of hallowed incense into it after the fashion of a Cross) he exhorts all to invoke the mercy of God, that he who vouchsafed to admit into the number of *Levites*, powring on him the clearness of his light, would inable him to perfect the prayses of that wax light, *cerei hujus laudem implere perficiat:* and then prayes *that this taper may remain constantly to destroy the mist of this night, and being accepted for a sweet smell may be mingled with the Heavenly lights.* In the blessing of holy water the Priest exorcizes the fact to be for the health of believers, and to all that take it soundness of soul, and body, and that all wickedness, and cunning of *devils* may fly from the place where it is sprinkled: and he exorcizes the water to drive away the power of the devil, and to root out

* L. 2. de effect. Sacram. c. 31. prop. 3.

out the enemy with the apoſtate Angels: and again prays, that this creature ſerving theſe miſteries, may receive the effect of the divine grace to drive away devils and expell diſeaſes, &c *. In the bleſſing of holy bread, he prays that God would bleſs it with holy ſpiritual bleſſing, *that it may be to all that receive it, health of Soul, and Body, and a defence againſt all diſeaſes, and all the ſnares of the enemies* †. So in the bleſſing of Candles, he prays, *that they may receive ſuch bleſſing by the ſigne of the Croſs, that in what ever places they are lighted, the Princes of darkneſs may depart, and tremble, and fly away with all his Servants from all thoſe habitations* *. In the bleſſing of the Croſs, he prays, that God would bleſs that wood of the Croſs, *ut ſit remedium ſalutare generi humano, ſit ſoliditas fidei bonorum operum profectus, & redemptio animarum*, &c. That it may be a wholeſome remedy for mankind, it may be firmneſs of faith, increaſe of good works, redemption

* *Miſſal.* Rom. *in Benedict. aqua.*

† *Miſſal.* Rom. *in Benedict. panis.*

* *Miſſal.* Rom *in Benedict. Candel.*

demption of Souls, and defence a-gainſt the cruel darts of the devil *. These are miſtical bleſſings which the *Romiſh* Church uſes, and which they pretend are derived from Apoſtolical Diſcipline, and Tradition, but it is uncertain, whether ever the Apoſtles did bleſſe thoſe Creatures for ſuch ſupernatural ends? and whether they did leave either command, or example which ſhould warrant the Church in after ages to bleſs any Creatures for the producing ſuch Effects? if it be certain, then they muſt produce ſome text of Scripture, ſo interpreted by the unanimous conſent of the Fathers, as the profeſſion of faith by *Pius* 4. requires: or ſome conſtant Tradition delivered down through the ſeveral ages of the Church: but neither of theſe can be done; for, *Secondly*, Their own Authors have affix'd the Inſtitution of theſe ſeveral forms of bleſſing to the times long after the Apoſtles, and ſo it cannot be ſaid that the Church hath received them from

* Hoſpin. de Orig. Templ. l. 4. c. 4.

from Apoſtolical diſcipline and Tradition: the bleſſing of the *Paſchal* taper is pretended to be the Inſtitution of *Zozimus* and *Theodore* the firſt, who ſate *anno* 640; the form of bleſſing to be dictated by *Ambroſe*, and that *Auguſtine*, and *Peter* a Monk of *Caſſino* compoſed others which are out of uſe, as *Durand* * tells us; but whether the ſame forme? or any ſuch kind of forme as is now in uſe? or whether any at all? we can have no certainty from Authors, who lived ſome hundred years after. Till 900. they can certainly prove, not only that a *Paſchal* taper was uſed in the Church, but that it was uſed from the Apoſtles times, and uſed for this end with ſuch like form of bleſſing as is now practiced by the *Romaniſts*, I do not ſee how the Council can declare this to be an article of faith that it came from Apoſtolical diſcipline and Tradition: the bleſſing of holy water was introduced (ſay the moſt of them) by *Alexander* the firſt, ſo ſay *Durand*,

* *Rationale Div. Offic. l. 6. c. 80.*

*Rational. l. 4. c. 4

† De Invent. Rerum l. 5. c. 8.

Durand*, Polydor Virgil †, and Platina in the life of *Alexander* the first, and yet this is far higher, than we can be certain of it: for there is no certainty of the *Epistle* ascribed to *Alexander*, whence they fetch this Institution, nor of the *Pontifical* ascribed to *Damasus* as *Reynolds* * shews from the acknowledgment of many of their own authors. The blessing of bread for driving away devils, (if we believe *Abdias* a frivolous Author l. 2. Histor. Apost.) is derived from St. *Peter*, as *Gavantus* † tells us: but what certainty have we of this Tradition, when we have no certainty even by their own confession of the truth, and honesty of this author? and if we believe him, when all antiquity is silent about it, he had need be *testis omni exceptione major:* besides this, the first blessing which *Gavantus* could bring was from *Gregory's* Sacramentary, about 600 years after the Apostles times, and p. still no certainty that it was from Apostolical Tradition:

* De Lib. Apoc. præl. 178, 180.

† Thes. Sacr. Rit. Part. 4. Tit. 19. n. 19.

Tradition: for the bleſſing of candles, they tell us *Sergius* appointed a proceſſion with hallowed candles on the feaſt of the Purification, but ſuppoſe the Inſtitution higher, as *Baronius* * doth, who fathers it on *Eligius*, who died *anno* 665, yet ſtill ſhort enough of the Apoſtles times: if thus their own authors who purpoſely inquire their Antiquities, aſſign their inſtitution after the Apoſtels daies, then it is not certain, that the Church received them from Apoſtolical Tradition: unleſs we can believe that rare expoſition which ſome * give of St. *Pauls* words to *Timothy*, 2 *Tim.* 1. 13. *Formam habe ſanorum verborum quæ à me didiciſti. Sanorum*, (*i. e.*) *quæ poſſunt ſanare ſenſibiles & inſenſibiles creaturas*, that the forme of ſound words was the forme of bleſſings for ſupernatural effects; but ſuch Interpretations, I ſuppoſe the ſoberer *Romaniſts* will ſooner deride, than believe.

* *In Martirologio.*

* Gavant *Theſ. Sacr. Rit. p. 4. Tit. 19. n. 2.*

Secondly, It is no way certain that they received the uſe of lights from

from Apoſtolical Tradition: the Church of *Rome* requires at *Maſs* the candels to be lighted, and though it be midday, yet allows no Celebration without it: but now, *Firſt*, Though the Apoſtles might uſe lights at the time of Divine Service, when they were forced to meet in Grotts, and Caves, and darke places, and commonly in the night (*cætibus antelucanis*) as *Pliny* obſerved, to avoid the danger of perſecution: yet there is no certainty that we are obliged by that example to light up Candles in the Day, nor any certainty that they left that rule for after Ages. *Secondly*, though the Church after the times of Perſecution did uſe lights to ſhew themſelves the Succeſſors of pious men, yet it's not certain that this was a neceſſary but voluntary imitation. *Thirdly*, as for thoſe ancients who pleaded for the Continuance of lights ti's no way certain, that they uſed them to expel devils or pretended any ſupernatural virtue in them but

but only as ſignes of joy, and repreſentations of Chriſt, as *Durand** gives us their miſtical ſignification.

Thirdly, It is no way certain, that they received the uſe of Incenſe from Apoſtolical Tradition; for, *Firſt*, though Incenſe might have been uſed in the Primitive Church either for ſome miſtical ſignification, as *Bellarmine* mentions three miſterious reaſons, or *ad tetrum odorem ſiquis ex multudine in Eccleſiâ exiſteret, abigendum*; to drive away thoſe Filthy ſmels which might be occaſioned by the concourſe of people, which is the moſt likely reaſon; for the Chriſtians being forced to aſſemble in ſubterranious Cels, and Caves, they might uſe incenſe to prevent the infection, which they might fear from the vapors in dark, and low places: but it is not certain, that they uſed Incenſe on the ſame reaſon it is now uſed by the *Romaniſts*, *ut omnes languores Cunctæque inſidiæ inimici odorem ejus ſentientes effugiant, & ſeperentur à plaſmate tuo, &c.* That all faintings

* *Rationale Div Offic. l. 1. c. 1. tit. 5.*

and treacheries of the devils perceiving this ſmel may fly away, and be removed from the workmanſhip which thou haſt redeemed by thy precious blood, and that they may never be hurt by the biting of the ancient Serpent*. Though the ancients might uſe Incenſe for ſweetning the places of their aſſemblies, yet it is uncertain, that they uſed it for devotion to drive away the devils temptations. The *Romiſh* Church requires at the Celebration of the *Maſs* the cenſing of the *Altar*, and the *Goſpels* which muſt be done three times, and the *Elements* which are to be conſecrated, drawing the Cenſer thrice upon the *Hoſt* and *Chalice* together in the faſhion of a *Croſſe*, and thrice round about them (*i.e.*) twice from the right hand to the left, and once from the left hand to the right †. afterwards he muſt cenſe the Croſs and the Altar again, then the Deacon cenſes the Prieſt, afterward he cenſes the Quire and the ſub-Deacon, then the

* *Inſit: Baptiz. &c. Stev. uſum. Sarum in bened. incenſi.*

† *Rubr. General. in offert. Miſſal.* Pii. 5.

the censer bearer censes the Deacon, then the Acolites, lastly the People *. And all this is done to drive away devils, saies *Innocent* † the third in his exposition of the Mass: and *Gavantus* * from him: but by what record? or what ground shall I be certain that the Apostles commanded this? or that their Church in conformity to the practice of the Apostles did thus? or Lastly, that the present *Roman* Church pretends no other virtue, or efficacy in Incense, than was allowed by the ancient Church. *Secondly*, I have further reason to question the uncertainty of this pretended Tradition, for even several authors of the *Roman* Communion have affixed a far latter date to the beginning of this Institution: *Platina* †, and *Polydor Virgil* * refer it to *Leo* the third who was the 98th Bishop of *Rome* according to *Platina*.

* *Rubr. Genera'. in effect. c.7.n.10.* † *l.2.c.17.*

* *Com. in Rubr. Missa. pa.1. tit. 4.n. 4. l.ic.B.*

† *In vitâ Sixti. 1.*

* *De Invent. rerum. l.5. c.10.*

Fourthly, It is no way certain that they received the use of *Priestly* Garments from *Apostolical* Tradition,

though we do not contend whether the Priest may use distinct Garments in the Celebration, for the practice is according to St. *Hierome's* expressions, *Religio divina alterum habet habitum in ministerio alterum in usu, vitâque communi*, that their habits in their ministration were different from those they commonly used: yet we judge these are *liberæ Institutionis*, which are indifferent in themselves, and not absolutely necessary: such things as the Church may injoyne from its own authority in things indifferent, not which it must injoyne from Apostolical command. For, *First*, We are no way certain that the Apostles practiced or commanded such things, that either at the first Institution by our Saviour, or at the Celebration of the Sacrament by the Apostles they used any such Priestly Garments: and so. *Polydor Virgil** saies, *Hebraica magis quam Apostolica referunt instituta*, they more resemble the *Jewish* than *Apostolical Institutions*. *Secondly*, We

* *De Invent. Rerum. li. 4. c. 7.*

We are not certain, that though God did appoint in the *Old* Teſtament ſuch habits for *Aaron* and his Sons, when they were to miniſter, the Prieſts po. in the *New* Teſtament muſt have ſuch: for all agree, that nothing preſcribed in the *Moſaical* miniſtration doth bind us Chriſtians, unleſs where the nature of it is *Moral*, elſe we ſhould be obliged to obſerve all the Rites annd Ceremonys which *Moſes* appointed: and po. it ſeems very ſtrange that *Bellarmine* ** ſhould ſay, that the Garments of the *Aaronical* Prieſts were Figures, and Types of thoſe Veſtments which the Chriſtians uſe: for to repreſent and tipify ſomething to be uſed in the times of the Goſpel requires a Divine Inſtitution: but it is no way certain that they were ſo appointed by Divine Inſtitution, po. we cannot aſſert that they are Figures and Types of the Prieſtly Veſtments which are now uſed. *Thirdly*, If we look on the ſeveral habits which belong to their *Clergy*, we ſhall think

** L. 2. de Miſſâ. c. 14.

it very unlikely, that they were derived from the Apoſtles, either if we conſider the things required, or the ſignifications they aſſign to them.

Firſt, As for the things required, there are ſix things required in the attire of a Prieſt, but 15 ſeveral parts of the attire of a Biſhop as *Durand** reckons them: and though the High Prieſt among the *Jewes* had only eight things in his attire, yet the Biſhop muſt have fifteen, becauſe (forſooth) as *Durand* gives the accurate reaſon, our righteouſneſs muſt exceed the righteouſnes of *Scribes*, and *Phariſes*. Nay theſe fifteen are not all, for beſides theſe he wears his *Surpliſs* and his *pluviale*: now it's very improbable, that the Apoſtles ſhould require more than *Moſes* did, or that when they impoſed ſuch ſeveral habits, that yet neither in the Scripture nor Primitive writers, there appear the leaſt footſtep of this injunction. *Secondly*, If we conſider the grounds they pretend, and the

* *Ration. Div. Offic. l. 3. c. 1. tit. G. H.*

the ſignification they give them, it will ſeem altogether improbable that they ſhould be derived from the Apoſtles. The *Sandals* (ſay they) come from the Apoſtles who uſed Sandals, *Mark*, 6 9. But if the Apoſtles example there be a ſufficient argument, then they muſt neither have a Staff in their Journy, nor Mony in their Purſe: or if they pretend our Saviours command, Go, teach all nations, which reaſon *Durand* * gives, that will never ſute with the grandeur of their Biſhops, nor yet with their practice, who do not uſe to foot it, to Preach in their own Cures. The Miter (ſaies *Baronius* †) came from the Apoſtles, and the Biſhop with his Miter repreſents *Moſes* coming down from the Mount with the 2 Tables: but if it came from the Apoſtles, how comes it to have 2 Horns? becauſe (ſay they) *Moſes* when he came from the Mount was Horned *; an error which the *vulgar* Tranſlation has occaſion'd by miſinterpreting a word. For where it

* *Rationale Div. Offic. l.3. c.8.nit. A.*

† *Ad annum.34. n.298.*

* Polyd. Virgil. *de Invent. Rer. l.4. c.7.*

should be read his face shone. That translation renders it *cornuta erat facies ejus*, *Exod.* 34. 2. and yet here's an Apostolical Tradition pretended to justifie their mistake. But this is not all, why must it be Horned? to note (saies *Durand**) the 2 Testaments: why must the *Miter* have two stays hanging behind? to note (saies he) the Spirit and the letter. Why must it be made high? to note the eminency of knowledge which must be in a Bishop: the *Gloves* (saies *Durand*†) must be put on according to the Tradition of the Apostles, next after the *Dalmatica* that his left hand may not know what his right hand doth. And why Gloves to cover their hands? because workes must be publick, but the intention secret*: why must he sometimes put them off and sometimes put them on? because good works must sometimes be secret to shun vain glory, sometimes publick to edefy their neighbours. (Saies *Durand*) will ye see more of these five reasons

*Rationale Div. Offic. l. 3. c. 13. tit. C. D.

†1. 61. l. 13. c. 12.

* Gavant. Thes. Sacr. Rit. Part 2 tit. 1. pag. 98.

reaſons which their *Ritualiſts* give concerning *Prieſtly*, and *Epiſcopal* habits; and you will then think that thoſe who pretend to give a reaſon of thoſe Ceremonies do only *inſanire cum ratione*; and that 'tis very unlike the ſimplicity of Religion which the Apoſtles delivered. *Fourthly*, I add that 'tis ſo far from being certain, that theſe Garments came from the Apoſtles, that their own authors tell us, that at firſt they ſaid Maſs in their uſual Garments, ſo *Gavantus* * out of *Walafrid Strabo*, and that by degrees the multitude of theſe habits which are now uſed, were brought in †. *Laſtly*, 'Tis uncertain whether the authors of the greateſt antiquity aſſert, what they affix to them: for ſome aſcribe this to *Clement*, that he according to Tradition from St. *Peter* did inſtitute theſe holy Veſtments, but there is no certainty of this pretended Tradition, nor of this pretended Inſtitution: ſome aſcribe it to *Anaclet*, antiquity enough if it could be proved,

* Part. 1. tit. 18.

† Gavant. 161.

ved, (whether he be the ſame with *Cletus*, whom ſome make a Coadjutor to St. *Peter*, or that there were ſuch an one who was immediate ſucceſſor to *Clement*) but we muſt be firſt ſure of the authority, before we believe the Teſtimony: *Bellarmine** durſt not call theſe decretal Epiſtles undoubted, though he believed them ancient: but there needs no more proof of the ſpuriouſneſs of this Epiſtle father'd on *Anaclet*; than to obſerve the Barberous expreſſions in it, and thoſe names it mentions, which were of a later Original †. Thus I have handled the firſt part of my argument from the Rites, and Ceremonies of the *Romiſh* Church, that for many of theſe things they require us to profeſs, to be of Apoſtolical Diſcipline, and Tradition, it is wholly uncertain, whether they be ſo.

* De Roman. Pontif. l. 2. c. 14.

† Blondel. Cenſ. Epiſt. Pontif. in Anaclet. Epiſt. 1.

Secondly, It is not certain, whether many Rites and Ceremonies of the *Romiſh* Church be not vain, unprofitable, and inexcuſable from *Superſtition:*

perſtition: I will not inſtance in the cuſtoms of particular Churches, and places. As in the manner of the obſervations of *Innocents* day by the *Epiſcopus puerorum* in the Church of *Salisbury:* in the ſtrange cuſtome which Mr. *Gregory* * produces from the Ritual of *Oſny* Abby of the foot of a Child, which was uſually kept in a Cheſt in the Veſtry, and that day was carried about the Church to be adored by the people. In the cuſtom of the *Belgick* Churches to take up a man on *Aſcention* day, thereby to repreſent Chriſts aſcention, and ſend down a *Dove* in repreſentation of the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt on *Whit-Sunday*, as the *Antiquitates Liturgicæ* tells us †. I will not inſtance in ſuch cuſtomes, though many may be produced, becauſe the *Romaniſts* will grant, the cuſtomes of particular Churches may be vain, and ſuperſtitious: but the Council of *Trent* doth only require that we ſhould imbrace the Rites of the Catholick Church: and appoints a reformation

* *Opuſc. Poſth. in his Diſcourſe de Epiſc. puerorum.*

† *Tom 2. in Sabbato Sancto de Cer. Paſch. Duacl. 1065.*

formation of thoſe abuſes which might have crept in, as in the number of Candles on *Eaſter* eve, ſome (ſaies *Durand*) have 72 Candles, ſome 24, ſome 15, ſome 12, and all theſe pretend ſome miſtery: now the Council provides againſt the Superſtitious number of Candles; and alſo by the Bull of *Pius* 5. prefixed before the *Roman* Miſſal, all other Rites and Ceremonies in other Miſſals (unleſs where there is a preſcription of 200 years) are abrogated. So that my buſineſs is to prove, that there are many Ceremonies univerſally practiced in the *Romiſh* Church or allowed in ſome particular Churches, which are vain, unprofitable, and not unexcuſable from ſuperſtition.

Firſt, I inſtance in the many Ceremonies of bleſſing the *Font*, the recital of which is a ſuffieient evidence of their vanity: one Ceremony is the dividing the water after the faſhion of a Croſs, and that is done that the water may be fruitfull through

through the holy Spirit, and the unclean one expel'd *: again, he muſt touch the water with his hand, that by the Invocation of the bleſſed *Trinity* the water may be defended, leaſt the divel return †: again, he divides the water with his hand, and caſts the water towards the foure parts of the World: another Ceremony is the changing of the Tone, which muſt be done thrice, after the manner of a prayer he muſt ſpeak low, then he muſt raiſe his voice after the manner of their Prefaces, then he muſt let fall his voice after the manner of reading the Leſſons: but why muſt the voice be changed thrice? *Vt in Trinitate omnia fiant* ſaies *Gavantus* *: another Ceremony is the breathing on the water three times after the faſhion of a Croſs, and leaſt that ſhould not do the work, he muſt blow thrice upon it after the manner of the Greek letter Ψ to denote the Trinity, that he may joyne the Trinity with the Croſs †: but what will this blowing do?

* *Miſſal.* Pii 5. *in Benid. Fontis.*

† Durand. *Rationale l.6.c.82.*

* *Part.4. Tit. 10. n.25.*

† Gavant. *16.n.26.*

do? they'l tell you (if you believe them) the devil is blown away with a breath and they blow in contempt of him; as if the devil could not withstand a blast: There is another Ceremony the putting the paschal taper into the Font, which must be first a little way and the Priest saies, *Descendat in hanc plenitudinem Fontis Spiritus Sancti virtus*, let the virtue of the holy Ghost descend upon the fullness of the Font: but will ye know the reason of this Ceremony, it is to signify the spirits descending with his fullness into the Font, as he descended at the baptisme of our Saviour in likeness of a Dove*; this taper then must be taken out, to note the effect of baptisme, which raises from sin to glory, then the taper must be put lower into the water, and the Priest raise his voice, the third time the taper must be put to the bottome, and the Priest repeat the prayer (*Descendat in hanc*, &c.) lowder. I omit the rest of the Ceremonies, for I need not render the office

* Gavantus 161. n. 27.

office more ridiculous, by repeating more of the like nature: and if there be so little reason for the institution of them, and such anticknes in the performance of them, we have reason to judge that it is at the best uncertain, whether they be not vain, and unprofitable.

Secondly, I instance in many Ceremonies used in *Baptisme*, I do not condemn every Ceremony in it, for some of them were very anciently used, some may not be unfit to signifie either some duty, or some priviledge: and these are not condemned by us, where they may serve to a decent order, and godly discipline, and may have any aptnes to stirre up the mind of man by some notable signification to the remembrance of his duty *, and while they are as St. *Augustin* advices *paucæ & salubres*. I pass by the number of their Ceremonies in Baptism, which *Bellarmine* saies are 22, and only consider, that many of these either have no tendency

* *Book of Common prayer Prof. of Ceremonies.*

dency to excite us by a fit ſignification, or elſe are uſed not only for ſignification, but extraordinary operation: now theſe things cannot produce by an extraordinary operation, unleſs by the virtue and influx of a ſuperior agent: and where there is no aſſurance of any aſſiſtance from ſuch a ſuperior agent, theſe Ceremonies muſt be vain, unprofitable, and ſuperſtitious.

Firſt, Some of them have no tendency to excite us by a fit ſignification, I paſs by the Ceremony of putting ſalt into the infants mouth, yet I may wonder whence the Prieſt hath authority to ſay, take the ſalt of wiſdome, that God may be propitious to thee unto Eternal life. Or what ground to pray that he who taſts this food of ſalt may not hunger more, as if it was equall to that Heavenly bread which our Saviour promiſed, of which whoever eats ſhall live for ever, *John* 6.58. I mention the Ceremony of ſpittle, that the Prieſt muſt ſpit on his left hand,

and

and put the ſpittle into the eares and noſe of the Infant with his right thumb, ſaying to the right eare, *Epphata* be thou opened, he muſt ſay to the noſe for a ſweet ſmell: and to the left eare be thou driven away O devil, for the judgement of God approaches: but why muſt he ſay to the eare be thou opened? and why doth he touch the noſe with ſpittle and put his finger into the eares? *Durand* wants no reaſon (as he thinks) he muſt touch the noſe that it might receive the odor of the knowledge of God, he muſt touch the eares to hear the commands of God, the fingers put into the eares muſt repreſent the words, or gifts of the holy Spirit. He muſt touch the eares with ſpittle, to ſignifie the words proceeding from the mouth of the higheſt, which enter through the eares, and ſmel ſweet to him: the noſtrills muſt be touched, that they may receive divine virtue, by which they may diſtinguiſh a good ſmel from a bad, and ſeperate ſound

* Durand *Rational. l. 6. c. 8. lit. R.*

Doctrine from Heretical pravity *: if we think these to be far fetched reasons, I wonder how they first invented such insignificant, vain Ceremonies. *Bellarmine* will retort on us our Saviours practice, how he touched the mans tongue, and eares who was deaf and dumb. *Mark* 7. 32, 33. and cured the blinde mans eyes with clay and spittle, *John* 9. 6. and yet he could have cured without those Ceremonies: well, but what is this Ceremony to our Saviours practice? what he used in the curing of the deaf and blinde, they use to them who are neither deaf nor blinde: if our Saviour used it in the producing a miraculous effect, is it not ludicrous for them to use it in imitation of him, where they do not pretend to imitate him in working the effect? if then, there's no aptness to signifie nor proper reason can be assigned of their Institution, then they are vain and unprofitable.

Secondly, Let us see those *Ceremonies*

nies which are used not only for signification, but the effecting of some thing: the Child must be *Croſt* several times, and in several places on his *forehead*, on his *breaſt* and on his *right* hand, and that not *principally* for signification, as *that they are not aſhamed to confeſs the faith of Chriſt crucified*, but for *the effecting ſome wonderfull thing*, as *driving out the devil*, ſo in the order for making *Catecumens* when the Prieſt ſignes him on the right hand, he ſaies, *I deliver thee the Seal of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt in thy right hand that thou may'ſt ſigne thy ſelf, and defend thee from the enemy, and abide in the Catholick faith, and live for ever:* If this will not ſuffice, there is another thing, that the Child muſt be anointed with *Oyle* on the breſt, and on the ſhoulder bones *with the Oyle of Salvation in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, that thou may'ſt have Eternal Life:* and the effect of this Oyle is for purging of his ſins, and defence from the devil *. I paſs by the white garment which is put on the Infant,

* Durand *Rationale l. 6. c. 71. lit. L.*

or the burning *taper* put into his hand, because as they are barely *significative*, we leave them among indifferent things, which every Church may injoyne, as she judges them usefull for decency, and edification. But there is one rare thing behind, a receit against the falling sickness *, *The Priest may say a Gospel over the Child, if he will, which (the Doctors say) is very effectual, and that is out of St. Mark concerning the curing of of the Child, which was sometimes thrown into the fire and sometimes into the water*; and the like ground *Fitz-Simon* gives of the reading of the first of St. *John* after the ending of the Mass, because many had found it effectual against some diseases, with which they had been afflicted: p. the Priest to satisfie all mens desires used to conclude the Mass with the Gospel. Now I aske what assurance can we have that those Ceremonies which themselves invent, have such power to effect these things? what certainty that the first of

* *Instr. Baptiz. & sec. usum Sarum. in fine Bapt. smi.*

of St. *John* read, which the people do not understand, is more effectuall than the first of St. *John* tied about their necks? and whether to ascribe such effects to them, which are above their nature where there is neither divine command, nor promise can be cleared from superstition.

Thirdly, I instance in the blessing of *Bells* out of the Instit. *Baptizandi, &c. secundum usum Sarum:* when the metal is running, the Priest putting on his *Surplis*, and *Stole* the *Cross* going before him with the Clergy, and people, they sing the Himn *Veni Creator:* when it is finisht, they sing the *Te Deum*, and in the end *Da Pacem*, with some versicles: before it is hung, it must be blessed, and consecrated, and p. first he prays * over the holy water, with which it is sprinckled, *Ut cum hoc vasculum ad invitandos Ecclesiæ Filios præparatum, in eâ fuerit tinctum, ubicunque hoc sonuerit tintinnabulum, longè recedat virtus inimicorum*, &c. that where-

* *Inst. Bapt. sec. usum Sarum. in Bened. Campan. Orat. Benedom. Domin.*

ever this Bell ſounds, the power of enemies, the ſhadows of apparitions, the fury of whirlewinds, ſtriking of thunderbolts, calamities of tempeſts, and every ſperit of ſtormes may be gone: then he muſt waſh it with holy water, hallowed oyle, and ſalt, and ſay this Prayer, that God who Commanded by *Moſes* ſilver Trumpets to be made, which the *Levites* ſhould ſound at the time of Sacrifice, and the people admoniſht by their ſweetneſs be prepared to worſhip thee, &c. Would grant that this veſſel prepared for the uſe of his Church, might be ſanctified with the holy ſperit, that by the ſound of it the faithful might be invited to their reward, and when the melody of it ſounds in their eares, their devotion may increaſe, the treacheries of the enemy may be driven away, the ſounds of haile-ſtones, the ſtorme of whirlewinds, and the violence of tempeſts may be moderated, &c. then he muſt wipe it with a towel, ſaying the 28th

Pſalme,

Pſalme, after this he muſt touch it with *Chryſme* 7 times on the out ſide and 4 times on the inſide, ſaying *O Almighty God who madeſt Stone walls to fall before the Ark of the Covenant, by the ſound of Trumpets, poure out thy bleſſing on this Bell, that the fiery darts of the enemy, the ſhaking of Thunder may be driven far off, before the ſound of it:* and in another prayer, *that the enemies army may be affrighted, the people cal'd by it may be comforted in the Lord, and the holy Spirit even as it was delighted with Davids Harpe may deſcend upon them:* then the Bell muſt be ſprinckled with holy water, and the Prieſt muſt name it, laying his hands upon it, and ſo muſt the *Godfathers* and *Godmothers*, who muſt name it after the Prieſt, and cover it with Linnen cloaths, and after this *benediction* the Bell becomes ſo holy that no man muſt Tole it, unleſs he wear a hallowed *Surplis*, ſaies *Gavantus* * from a Council of *Colen*. This is their ſtrange way of bleſſing Bells, which

* Part. 1. tit. 20.

almoſt needs no other refutation, than bare recital of the manner of it: for what reaſon of anointing within and without? or if it was no more than in imitation of the *Jewes* to ſeperate this for an holy uſe, yet why 7 times on the outſide, and 4 times on the inſide, why muſt this be cenſed, and ſo that it may gather up all the ſmoak? and why muſt it be named in ſo ſolemn a manner? what uſe of *Godfathers* and *Godmothers* here, of laying their hands on it, afterwards of covering it with Linnen cloathes, which is an imitation of that Ceremony of the white garment they uſed in Baptiſm? and why do they pray that their ſound may drive away devils, frighten enemies, hinder ſtorms, &c? as by the ſound of Trumpets the walls of *Jericho* fell down: for there was both a command that the *Prieſt* ſhould blow the Trumpets, and a promiſe of extraordinary bleſſing: here is no ground to pretend either command, or promiſe.

I might Instance in their strange forms of exorcizing persons possessed with devils, the vanity of which is sufficiently described by my Lord Bishop of *Downe* in his excellent dissuasive from Popery, for they rather seem like magical Enchantments than devout formes of prayer.

I might Instance in their consecrations of *Chrysme*, how it must be brought from the *Vestry* to the *Bishop* by 12 *Priests* representing the 12 *Apostles*; and by other *Clergy* men signifying the *Disciples*, how after it is blessed it must be saluted by the Bishop and his Priests 5 times with a lowd voice *ave Sanctum Chrysma* hayle holy Chrisme; and how the Bishop must breath 3 times on it, as *Durand** gives us the forme. I could instance in their strange formes of processions with anticks going before them, as if they intended rather to Create laughter, than stir up Devotion: a custome which *Polidor Virgil** confesses was without doubt

† *Rational. l. 6. c. 74.*

* *de Invent. rerum. l. 6. c. 11.*

doubt received from the heathenish *Romans*. I could Instance in their acting of the passion, which turns the whole seriousnes of religion into a *mimical* sport, as *Ludovic Vives* * complained: many more of this nature I could reckon up, but these are to many.

* *in August. de Civit. Dei. l. 6. c. ult.*

The sum of the second *argument* is this: it is unreasonable to adhere to that Church, which not only practices such cerimonies which are vain, and ridiculous, and which is at best, uncertain, whether they be not superstitious, but requires all to owne them for good, and wholesome: but the Church of *Rome* doth so: ꝑo.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

MY third *Conſideration* ſhall be drawn from the abſurdities and untruths in ſeveral Offices, becauſe there are ſeveral things falſe, many things derogatory from the merits of Chriſt, and aſcribing too much to the Creature.

Firſt, I inſtance in the prayers they make to the *B. Virgin*, the Titles they aſcribe to her, and the praiſes they give her. *Firſt*, In the prayers to her: it is certain that a great part of the devotion of the *Romaniſts* is employed in the prayers to her: ſhe hath her *Fices*, ſhe hath her *Houres*, ſhe hath her *Letany*, ſhe hath her *Roſary*, and *Gregory* 13. Inſtituted a Maſs in honour of the Roſary with Indulgences to them that celebrate it: ſhe hath her *Pſalter* compoſed by *Bonaventure*, which are onely *Davids* Pſalms deformed, in which

which the name of *Lady* is put for *Lord*, and what he said of God is ascribed to the *B. Virgin*: she hath 8 *Festivals*; and least they should faile in the performance of their duty to her, there is a peculiar Mass in the *Missal* of *Salisbury*, call'd *Missa recollectionis festorum B. Mariæ*. Let us consider the prayers themselves, in which they do not only intreat her to *pray* for them, or *pray* that God would grant their requests upon the intercession of the *B. Virgin*, but they desire that by her merits and prayers they may be brought to Heaven *. And if you think they do not derogate from the *Son* who leane on the *merits* of the *Mother*, you shall find them equal'd in a prayer of the Mass of the most holy *Rosary*, where they pray, that God who predestinated Jesus Christ according to the flesh, and chose the most holy Virgin to be his mother, would grant that through both their merits compleated by the 15 sacred mysteries of the Rosary, we may be so for the present addicted

Missale sec. usum Sarum. an. 1555. in Vigil. *Pasch.*

* *Offic. B. Virg. ad matutin.*

to

to them, that we may continually perceive in our ſelves the fruit of them in the glory of an Heavenly life, *præſta quæſumus, ut amborum meritis per ſacra* 15 *myſteria Roſarij completis ità in præſenti ſimus illis addicti, quatenus in cœleſtis vitæ gloriâ fructus eorum jugitur ſentiamus* *; nay its well if they do not queſtion, whether they do not owe more to the Mothers milk, than to the Sons blood, for that was not only a *Poetical* fancy of *Carolus Scribanius*, but was crept up into a Picture (which they call a Lay mans Book) on a wall in a Church at *Boſledue*, and there found by the *Dutch* at the taking of the Town: from interceſſion ſhe is got to commanding, and ſhe that acknowledged in the *Magnificat* the lowlineſs of his Handmaid, is importuned to command by the authority of a Mother: and if we conſult their Offices there is little can be deſired of our Saviour which they do not ask of her, and do not only deſire her interceſſi-

* *Miſſal. Rom. in Miſſ. Roſarij* Paris 1631.

on

on for bleſſings, but deſire from her the bleſſings themſelves: in the Himn *Ave Maris ſtella*, which is ſung at the feaſt of the preſentation of *Mary*, they ſay *Solve vincla reis, profer lumen cæcis, mala noſtra pelle, bona cuncta poſce*, which in the Office tranſlated into Engliſh is ſomething minced,

The guilty Souls deliver, Light to the Blind reſtoring,
Drive hence our Harms for ever, all Good for us imploring;

But at the prime they go higher, *Maria Mater gratiæ mater miſericordiæ, tu nos ab hoſte protege & in hora mortis ſuſcipe*, which the Engliſh office renders,

O Mary Mother whence grace flowes, who Mother of ſweet mercy Art,
Protect us from our dangerous foes, receive us when we hence depart:

What tolerable excuſe can be given for

for thoſe words, and generous *Mary* obtain pardon for us, apply grace unto us and prepare glory for us *. Or that prayer in the Sequence † (as they call it) *pro nobis obtine genitrix veniam, reatum dilue & dona patriam in arce ſiderum:* procure our pardon, waſh away our guilt, and give us heaven? or for that commendation of the Soul to the Virgin*, O holy *Mary* my Lady, I recommend my ſelf unto thy bleſſed truſt, and ſingular cuſtody and into the boſome of thy mercy, this day, and daily, and in the houre of my death, as alſo my Soul, and body, and I yield unto thee all my hope and conſolation, all my diſtreſſes, and my miſeries, my life, and the end thereof, that by thy moſt holy merits, and interceſſion, all my works may be directed, and diſpoſed according to thine, and thy Sons will? if we may place our hope and confidence in the *B. Virgin*, in all our afflictions, both in life, and death, what could we do more on *Chriſt*? or how could they expreſs greater

* *Ex curſu Hor. Beat. Mariæ.*
† *Miſſa. Recoll. feſt. Mariæ in Miſſal. Sar. 1555.*
* *Office of our Lady in Engliſh.*

greater affiance on Christ, than they do here of the Virgin? or in what fuller terms can they resigne up themselves to their Saviour; than they use here to her, when they commend themselves to her, that by her merits and intercession all their workes may be directed according to her's, and her sons will? where then the Creature is drawn off from his intire confidence on Christ, and perswaded to leane on a fellow creature, that must be absur'd and impious, but it is so in these prayers, &c.

Secondly, In the *titles* they ascribe to her, and the *Prayses* they give her: I do not speak of those flattering expressions which some superstitious persons have used, as *Bernadinus Senensis & Bernardinus de Bustis*: of whom the former saies *. That the Blessed Virgin did more for God, or at least as much as he did unto all mankind, and for our comfort we may say that in respect of the Blessed Virgin God himself is after a sort

* Bernar. Senens. *Serm.* 61. *Art.* 1. *c.* 11.

ſort more bound to us, than we to him. The other ſaies * that though the Virgin ſang, he that is mighty hath done great things to me, yet he durſt ſay, thou haſt done greater things to him who is mighty. Theſe I will not charge on them, which may ſeem rather the extravagancies of private fancies, than any allowed expreſſions, yet if we conſult their publick Offices, we ſhall ſee thoſe things aſcribed to her, which are abſur'd, and unfit to be aſcribed to any Creature: to call her the *Star* of the Sea which ſeeming like ſome title the *Poets* gave to *Venus*, may paſs by a *Poetical* licence, but to call her *Mother* of *Mercy*, *Queen* of *Heaven*, *Lady* of *Angels*, *Empreſs* of the *World* *. Theſe we think are groundleſs Titles, which ſavour rather of a luxuriant wit, than any true piety: for though ſhe is bleſſed among women, yet we do not find her exalted above Angels: though ſhe was full of grace, yet here's no reaſon to call her mother of

* Bern. de Baſtis Mariale part. 6. Serm. 2. membr. 3.

* Offic. B. Mariæ ad Laudes Feſto. Purif. Himno Ave Regina.

grace: though she be exalted into glory, yet why must she be cal'd *Queen* of *Heaven*? why do they pray Queen of Angels bring us into the kingdom of Heaven? as it is in the *Breviary* of *York* *: why do they sing in the Office of the Virgin on the Purification?

* *Infra Octa Assumpt. Mar. 6. die Bened. commun.*

Hayle Queen *the Heavenly armies guiding.*
Hayle Lady *over Angels biding.*

Miss. recoll. Fest. B. Mar. post oration. secretam.

Enough of this is to be had in the *Salisbury* Missal, as that God hath done mercifully with us, since he hath appointed his mother to be our *Advocate* in Heaven, and in the Sequence sung on the Feast of the Conception, that she is the mother of Orphans, the ease of the oppressed, the help of the weak, and they add *omnibus es omnia:* now what ground to ascribe these superlative honours to her? what assurance that these are not unwarrantable Titles? but they go further, and tell us, the reverence they

they ſhew to the mother, is given to the Son, and po. with their whole deſires, and voices, they inſiſt on her praiſes, and ſay that ſhe in the bearing of her Son did deſtroy *antiquum diabolicæ ſeditionis Chirographum*, the ancient hand writing of deviliſh ſedition, and opened the kingdom of Heaven to believers *. There is a prayer to the B. Virgin, in which they call her Fountain of mercy, Fountain of health and grace, Fountaine of comfort and Indulgence, Fountain of piety and joy, Fountain of life and pardon †: If they aſcribe to her theſe Titles, then they give to the Creature, what is due to the Creator, God bleſſed for ever; how can they call her Fountain of grace? when it is the honour of Chriſt, that *of his fullneſs we receive grace for grace* †; *and in him all fullneſs dwels* †: or how is ſhe the Fountain of life, when 'tis Chriſts peculiar houour to have life in him †, *and our life is hid in Chriſt*; or how can ſhe be the Fountain of pardon?

* *Brochar Eborcommem. B. Mar. Lect. 1.*

† *Offic. B. Mar. inter orationes.*

† *Iohn 1. 16.* † *Coloſ. 1. 19.*

† *1 Iohn 5. 11.*

when through Christ alone we have remission of sins by his blood. Or how can they sing that redundancy of grace is given to the Virgin, whereby all things are fragrant and acceptable to God. *O nimia redundantia gratiæ datæ Virgini, quâ cuncta sunt fragrantia, & grata summo numini* †, when 'tis by Christ alone we are made acceptable to the Father: This is the sum of this first Instance, that in the Offices of the Virgin there are many prayers unfit to offer to any Creature, and many Titles ascribed to her, which are groundless, absur'd, and derogating from the honour of Christ.

† *Himn. Æterni Patris. in Præf. B. Mar. Paris apud Magd. Gourfette. 1595.*

Secondly, I instance in the absur'd expressions which they use to the Cross for they direct their prayers not only to Christ crucified, but (if there be any sense in the expressions) to the material Cross so in the Office of the Cross, they say, *O venerable Cross which hast brought Salvation to wretches, with what praises shall* †

† *Office of the Cross at Mattins in English.*

I

I extoll thee? for thou hast prepared unto us the Heavenly life? at the *Prime* they say, *O Admirable lignum, in Cœlesti curiâ fac nos cantare triumphum.* O Admirable wood, cause us to triumph in the heavenly Court: now this is absur'd to ascribe that to the Cross, which is onely due to Christ; who by his sufferings on the Cross purchased Salvation for us, or to direct our prayers and praises to that which was only an *inanimate* Instrument of Christs sufferings: but if these expressions do not seem strange, there is worse behind. At the *Feast* of the Invention of the Cross they sing *, *O Crux splendidor cunctis astris, mundo celebris sanctior universis*, &c. O Cross more glorious than all the Stars, famous in the world, holyer than all things, which wast only worthy to bear the price of the world: *Salva præsentem catervam laudibus tuis congregatam* †. Save this present company assembled for thy prayses: but how the Cross should be holyer than all things, how

* *Breviar.* Ebor. *Fest. Invent. Sanctæ Crucis.*

† *Brev.* Roman. *in Festo Invent. & Exalt. Crucis.*

it could be call'd worthy to bear Christ; I understand not: what excellency was there in that wood, which made it worthy to bear our Saviour? what worthy stock was it chosen from to touch his holy parts? as they sing in the Himn *Vixilla Regis* *: or by what propriety, and congruity of speech can they direct their prayers to that material wood to save them, who were met to celebrate its prayses? much like stuff if not worse remains behind in that Himn, *O Crux ave spes, unica hoc passionis tempore, auge piis justitiam, reisque dona veniam* *: hayle O Cros our onely hope in this passion time, increase righteousnes to the godly, and give pardon to the guilty; but how can they say the wooden Cros is their only hope? how can they beg righteousnes and pardon from it? if they tell us these are lofty *fancies* of pious wits, I must still wonder how their Church can allow such roving humors among their serious devotions; or how these expressions which

† Dominica *in passione inter Himnos editos* Paris. 1552.

† *Breviar.* Rom. *Festo Invent. Sanct. Crucis.*

which are designed for the praises of of the wooden Cross can by any tolerable congruity be understood of Christ; or if they be disallowed that yet they should be retained in the *Breviaries* reformed by *Pius* 5. another of these we have in the Breviary of *Salisbury*, on the *Feast* of the Invention of the Cross, *Ara Crucis, Lampas lucis, vera salus hominum, nobis pronum fac patronum quem tulisti Dominum:* where they intreat the wooden Cross to make Christ propitious to them. Such kind of prayers they have in their private devotions, as to our Ladies girdle, *O veneranda Zona fac nos hæredes vitæ Æternæ, & hanc vitam ab interitu conserva, habeamus te vires & auxilium, murum & propugnaculum*, &c. O blessed girdle make us the inheritors of eternal life, keep our present life from destruction, O unspotted girdle of the unspotted Virgin save thine inheritance, be thou our strength and help, our wall and defence, our heaven and refuge: such

also is the prayer to *Veronica* or the Picture of our Saviours bloody face on a napkin. *Salve vultus Domini imago beata, ex æterno munere mire decorata lumen funde cordibus ex vi tibi datâ; & à nostris sensibus tolle colligata*, &c. here they pray that by the virtue given to that Picture it would infuse light into their hearts: and they conclude, *nos deduc ad propria O fœlix figura, ad videndum faciem quæ est Christi pura*, O happy figure bring us to see the pure face of Christ: but what ground to hope for these blessings from insensible things? or to pray to them for these ends? or what assurance is there that such virtue is imprinted in them? and if there be no ground for such expressions, then they are unwarrantable and absurd.

Thirdly, I instance in their most sacred office of the mass, this themselves confess was anciently corrupted, and many things crept in (either through the fault of times or men's

mens negligence or wickednes) were far from the dignity of such a Sacrifice: * and p.o. the council required such things to be taken away, which either Covetousnes or irreverence, or superstition had brought in: accordingly the Missal was corrected by *Pius* the 5th and after another review publisht by *Clement* the 8th which is the Authentick Missal at this day, now in this I observe many things absurd, vain, or untrue I mention not the multitude of ceremonies which clog the service distract the Priests thoughts, and reduce the simplicity of Christianity to the *Jewish* Pædagogy: as in the frequent Crossing themselves, in the very canon of the Masse the Priest is enjoyned to make 25 Crosses at several times, besides the signing himself with the *Patten* from the forehead to the Brest, and with part of the host he must make the signe of the Crosse thrice on the *Chalice*: as litle reason can be given for the *Pax* which must be given only to Magistrates

* *Coxe. Trident. Sess. 22. Decr. de Observ. & evit. in Celeb. Miss.*

Magiſttrates and noble perſons *, or to be moſt eminent as *Gavantus* ſaies †, unleſs it were no matter to have Peace with the Poor, provided they could have it with the rich, aud ſo for the Preiſts murmuring the words of Conſecration, and when he places the Chalice on the Corporal for his ſaying with a low voice, *as oft as ye do this do it in remembrace of me*, and in the Cloſe of the *Lords Prayer* ſpeaking low. *Amen:* of theſe things they give ſo little reaſon that we may, with greater, judg them the fruit only of ignorance and ſuperſtition: I ſhall ſpeake only of the Prayers themſelves. *Firſt*, After the *Offertory*, when the Prieſt offers the wafer which he muſt afterward conſecrate, he ſaies, *Suſcipe ſancte pater hanc immaculatam hoſtiam, quam offero tibi deo vivo pro innumerabilibus peccatis & offenſionibus meis* *, receive Holy Father this immaculate hoſt, which I thy unworthy ſervant offer to thee the true and living God for my innumerable ſins, offences and negligences,

* *Carem. Epiſcop l.1.c 24.*

† *Part.2. tit. 10.*

* *Miſſal Rom. Paris 1631 Ordo. Miſſæ*

negligences, &c. now I ask what they mean by this immaculate hoſt which they offer for ſin? either they mean the wafer, or the real body of Chriſt: they cannot mean this latter for the body isnot under the *ſpecies* till after conſecration, and the conſecration (they ſay) is not till theſe words (*hoc eſt enim corpus meum*) be pronounced, and p. they cannot now offer the body, if they mean the wafer, then they offer to God bread for their ſins, which themſelves will confeſs is abſurd. *Secondly*, There is a Prayer which begins *Suſcipe Sancta Trinitas, &c.* And in this the Prieſt ſaies, he offers this oblation for the memory of our Saviours Paſſion, Reſurrection and Aſſention, and in the honour of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, St. *John Baptiſt*, and the Holy Apoſtles *Peter and Paul* that it may profit them for their Honour, and us for our Salvation: now of what doth the Prayer mean? take it either of the Elements or of Chriſts body yet I underſtand not how they can offer

for

for the Saints honour; how they can intreat God to receive Christs body in honour of his Saints; how an immediate act of adoration to God can be said to be profitable for their Saints honour; or if it may be profitable to increase their glory, how it can stand with their own *tenents*, that it is impious to pray for a *Martyr*, when yet they pray for St. *Peter* and *Paul, ut iis proficiat ad honorem*, but of this more afterwards. *Thirdly*, After the Consecration it is said, we offer unto thy excellent majesty of thy own gifts, a pure Host, a holy Host, the holy bread of Eternal life, and the Cup of Eternal Salvation, *super quæ propitio ac sereno vultu respicere digneris*, upon which things vouchsafe to look with a propitious and serene countenance, &c. Now this is absur'd, that we should pray that God would look propitiously on his own Son in whom he is allwaies well pleased: or that God would accept this Sacrifice of Christ, when it is that sweet smelling Sacrifice

fice which God allwaies doth accept. Indeed *Bellarmine* gives us an excuſe for the harſhneſs of theſe words, and ſaies, the offering in reſpect of the thing offered, and of Chriſt the principal offerer, alwaies pleaſes God, yet in reſpect of the miniſter or people who offer with him it may not pleaſe God, and po. they pray that God would look propitiouſly on this gift as it is offered by them: but this evaſion will not ſerve, for they tell us, that the value of this Sacrifice is not *ex opere operantis*, from the condition or worth of the miniſter, but *ex opere operato* from the nature of the thing it ſelf, becauſe it is done as the Law requires *, and po. it pleaſes God though he who offer it do not pleaſe him †; ſo that ſince the value of the Sacrifice is wholly from the thing that is offered, po. as it is offered by us or not, offered by us doth no way alter the acceptableneſs of it to God, but ſtill the prayer muſt remain abſur'd, for they pray that God would look

* Bell. l. 2. c. 4. de Miſſa. § ſecundo.

† § tertium ſit.

look propitiously on the body and blood of Christ, and accept them, when God allwaies doth accept them, and can never be displeased with them. *Fourthly*, There is a fourth prayer, which begins *supplices rogamus*, &c. There they pray, that God would command these things to be carried by his holy Angels unto the high Altar in the sight of his Divine Majesty, &c. Now what are these things? if they say, the prayers of the faithfull; that cannot be meant, for this prayer is to the thing spoken of in the former prayer, and that was the body and blood of Christ, the holy bread of Eternal life, and the Cup of everlasting Salvation; if they say that they are the body and blood of Christ (as it is plain from the words that they are) then these have been long since in Heaven, and Christ lives there to make intercession for us, how then can they be carried up into Heaven? and p). he fixes another sense *, that those expressions must be understood spiritually

* *l. 2. de Missa. c. 24. Sect. respondeo.*

ſpiritually, and ſignifie only this, that the Angels by their prayers commend our obedience to God; but ſtill he forgets, that the things here in the prayer are not our obedience, and ſervice, but the body and blood of Chriſt: that there is no mention of our obedience and ſervice in that prayer, but both this and the former prayer are connected with thoſe words, we offer to thee a pure Hoſt, an holy Hoſt, an undefiled Hoſt, the holy bread of Eternal life, and the Cup of everlaſting Salvation: for they ſubjoyne in the next words, *upon which things vouchſafe to look propitiouſly*, &c. and then follows this prayer, *we humbly beſeech thee, command theſe things to be carried*, &c. it muſt then be meant of his body and blood; but how unreaſonable is it to deſire the Angels may commend the Sacrifice of Chriſt with their prayers? or that their prayers ſhould aſſiſt to render the Sacrifice of Chriſt acceptable? as if any thing ſhould add any worth to

Chriſts

Christs Sacrifice: but if this will not remove the incongruities of this expression, *Durand* * tells us, *tantæ profunditatis sunt hæc verba, ut intellectus humanus vix ea sufficiat penetrare:* These are such profound expressions that humane understanding can hardly pierce into them: well said, a good excuse for nonsense; to call it a profound expression, or to condemn the weakness of our understandings when 'tis the absurdity of their words: these are fine things to please them, who are wont to admire every thing in the *Romish* Church; like those Courtiers which cry up the Princes stammering for a grace in his speech: a strange thing, that those expressions must pass for most Divine, which have least reason, and sense.

* Rational. Div. Offic. l. 4. c. 44. tit. E.

Thus I have instanced in several absurdities, untruths and impieties in the Offices of the *Romish* Church, which justifie my third argument, That it is unreasonable to be obliged to believe that to be the purest Church

Church whose publique Offices are very corrupt, but the Offices of the *Romish* Church are so, p.

CHAP. IV.

MY fourth *Consideration* shall be drawn from the Irreconcileable opposition of their prayers to their publique *Doctrine*: very many prayers which are contrary to their present Innovations are expunged, and many prayers yet retained cannot be reconciled with their present Doctrine, p. we have no reason to adhere to the present *Romish* Church.

First, Many prayers which were contrary to their present innovations are expunged, this is not only our complaint, but of one that lived, and died in the *Roman* communion *Johannes Marsilius* * saies, it is a thing known by all, that in the

* *Defesadi. Gio. Marsilio. Della 4. prop. contra il Card. Bellarmino.*

books of *Councels*, of *Canons*, and of the *Doctors*, yea in the *Breviaries* and *Missals* those places, are expunged, which speak in favour of the *Laity*, that they might see if they could establish from Antiquity, the opinion of the Popes illimited power in temporals; so that he who compares the Books Printed in 1530 and 1550, and those at present (*i*) at the time of the interdict of *Venice*, will wonder that we have found after such a vintage any gleanings in defence of our Prince: and 20. first I will give you his Instance in the prayer concerning St. *Peter* in the commemoration of St. *Paul June* 30. where it was anciently said, qui *B. Petro animas, ligandi & solvendi pontificium dedisti*, this he saies, he saw in Breviaries which had been written above 200 yeares, and which had been printed about an hundred, and yet the Reformers of the *Roman* breviary have left out the word [*animas*]: will you see *Bellarmines* answer? in his reply to *Marsilius* he saies *forsi la divina providentia*

videntia ha inſpirato li reformatori, &c. Perhaps the Divine Providence hath inſpired the reformers to take it away? but why muſt it be taken away; becauſe (as *Marſilius* ſtates the caſe) the Pope, deſigning the advancement of his Power that he might Challinge as St *Peters* ſucceſſor a power in temporals, ſaw that this reſtriction was no way conſiſtent with his deſign; for if the binding and looſing be properly of Souls, it muſt be a meerly Spiritual Power, and ſo no way conſiſtent with that ſupereminent power in temporals, which the Pope and his Courtiers claimed: a good reaſon then to take this away, and a fine excuſe to juſtifie it: Gods providence muſt inſpire theſe reformers ſuch an inſpiration indeed as the *Trent* Fathers had, when if we believe the Proverb, *the Holy Ghoſt came from* Rome *in a cloke-bag*: *Secondly*, I will give that Inſtance which the Arch Biſhop of *Spalato* * had obſerved in *Bertram's* book, when *Bertram* would prove

* *De Rep. Eccles. l. 3. c. 5. n. 164.*

that the bread and wine are figuratively the body and blood of Christ, and though they are call'd the body and blood of Christ, yet there are such things said of them which are Celebrated by the Church in a mistery, as cannot be said according to that manner they are known to exist, and Po. they must be understood to be the body and blood of Christ in a figure, he proves this by two prayers in the Missal, which were said after the Communion, the first is, *Pignus æternæ vitæ capientes humiliter imploramus, ut quod imagine contingimus Sacramenti manifestâ participatione sumamus:* taking the pledg of eternal life we humbly beseech, that what we touch in the *Image* of the Sacrament we may also receive by manifest participation: from hence *Bertram* gather'd, that a pledge, and an Image only signifying the things which they belong to, but not manifestly shewing them, po. that which is now made in the Sacrament is different from that which shall be afterwards manifested, po. that which

the

the Church Celebrates is the body and blood of Christ, but yet as a pledge, as an Image, and when there is no more pledge or Image the truth it self, (*i.e*) the body of Christ will apear: now this Prayer is not to be found in the Missal saies *Spalato*. Another he mentions, *Per ficiant in nobis Domine quæsumus, tua Sacramenta quod continent, ut quæ nunc specie geramus rei veritate capiamus*: let thy Sacraments O Lord effects in us what they contain, that what we now hold in shew, we may receive in truth; from this he argues, there being a difference betwixt *species* and *veritas* (*i.e*) betwixt what is in shew, and what is according to it's true nature p. that body & blood of Christ which is here held by the Church differs from that which shall be glorified in the resurrection: this prayer is clipt saies *Spalato*, & instead of *specie* they read *spe*, (yet since that is opposed to truth in this place, it shews that we do not receive that which is truly the body of Christ according to its proper nature) and so it was read

in their reformed Missals, in *Antiquitates Liturgicæ**, printed at *Doway* 1605. which the author saies he took *à capite ad calcem* out of the *Roman* Missal, the prayer runs, *ut quæ nunc specie geramus*, &c. but I wave this latter, for the word [*specie*] is now restored in the *Paris* edition of the Missal 1631. Many more alterations in their Offices might be produced, which will evidence the innovations in the Doctrine of their Church, and which (I hope) will be effected by by some industrious person, who hath the opportunity of variety of choice Missals and Breviaries, and their other books of devotion, whereby to discover those alterations of their present from their ancient Offices.

* *Sabbato A. tempo. sum per Balthas. Beller.* 1605.

Secondly, I will rather instance in those passages yet retained, and are not reconcileable with the grounds of their present *Doctrine*: As, *First*, I instance in the private Masses, when the Priest communicates alone; for many are bound by the Statutes of

of their foundation as the *Chantry* Priests to say Mass for the Souls of their founders, many persons for affection, some by agreement (and the highest ordinary rate in these Countries, saies *Fitz-Simon**, is a shilling) say a Mass, and p). whether there be any to Communicate or no, yea though but one to answer the Priest, and sometime none †, yet he saies Mass: and the Council of *Trent* though it wishes all who stand by would not only communicate by spiritual affection, but Sacramental participation of the *Eucharist*, yet it doth not condemn those *Masses*, in which the Priest communicates alone, but approves them, and commends them: now the prayers and rules of the Mass are no way reconcileable with this Doctrine, and practice: for, *First*, If there be none to communicate, how can the Priest use this exhortation which is in the *Ordo Missæ* after the prayer *Suscipe Sancta Trinitas? Orate fratres ut meum ac vestrum sacrificium*

* *Of the Mass 1 book 2 part 12 chapt.*

† Gavant. *part. 2. tit. 2. n. 1.*

ſit acceptabile, &c. pray bretheren that my Sacrifice and yours may be acceptable: *this exhortation* (ſaies the *Rubrick*) *muſt be ſaid by the Prieſt with his voice toward the people; and his Tone a little raiſed*, and in their private Maſs all this is done, though there be none preſent: the exhortation ſuppoſes ſome communicating or at leaſt ſome preſent, why muſt he ſay *Brethren*, if he ſuppoſes there needs be none, or at leaſt but one? why ſhould he *raiſe his voice*, when he can expect none to anſwer, unleſs the ſtones ſay *Amen*? why muſt he *turne to the people* if it ſuppoſe a Maſs where there are none, or but one preſent? *Laſtly*, why muſt he ſay *my Sacrifice and yours*, if it did not ſuppoſe ſome joyning in the ſacrifice? *Secondly*, I inſtance in that exhortation, *lift up your hearts* with the *reſponſe*, *habemus ad dominum*: if we liſt them up to the Lord, &c. ſo the Prieſt ſaies *dominus vobiſcum*, the Lord be with you, the anſwer is, *and with thy Spirit*, now if in the

the framing this Office, it were not ſuppoſed that others were preſent to whom the Prieſt might direct the exhortation, and that they ſhould return the anſwer it had been fooliſh to have appointed the uſe of theſe words: for its altogether vain, and rediculous to ſay, *lift up your hearts* when there is none to hear him, or to ſay, *let us pray*, when he prayes by himſelf, or *the Lord be with you*, when he ſpeaks to the bare walls. *Thirdly*, I inſtance in the *commemoratio pro vivis*, where the Prieſt deſires God *to remember all thoſe that ſtand by, whoſe faith and devotion are known to thee, for whom we offer, or who offer to thee this Sacrifice of praiſe*, &c. Now this expreſſion ſuppoſes there muſt be ſome that ſtand by, or elſe the Prieſt ſhould be bound ridiculouſly to pray for them that ſtand by, when there are none at all. *Fourthly*, I inſtance in the prayer *Supplices te rogamus*, &c. there he prayes *that as many of us as receive the body and blood of thy Son from this*

this participation of the Altar may be filled with all Heavenly Benedictions and Grace: here the Prayer ſuppoſes ſome receiving, or if there be none to receive with the Prieſt, how can he ſay *that as many of us as receive*, &c? *Bellarmin** thinks to ſolve this ſcruple by telling us, that theſe words are uſed for thoſe who communicate at preſent, and if there be none then it muſt refer to thoſe who are abſent, who communicate elſewhere: but this will not ſerve, for the Prayer refers to thoſe who communicate here and not elſewhere: for elſe how can it ſay *as many of us?* and *as many as receive from this participation of the Altar?* for the words [*this participation*] *ex hac altaris participatione*, reſtrain it to thoſe who are now to receive. *Laſtly*, I inſtance in the prayer after the Prieſt hath received, *quod ore ſumpſimus*, &c. *what we have O Lord taken with our mouthes, let us alſo receive with a pure mind*, &c. Now how can they ſay this, unleſs they ſuppoſe

* l. 2 de Miſſa. c. 10. reſp. ad obj. 10.

ſuppoſe ſome receiving? for if they only Communicate ſpiritually, as the Council of *Trent* ſaies, aſſiſting with their prayers, then they cannot be ſaid to receive it with their mouthes, beſides he deſires *that what they have received with their mouthes, they may receive with a pure minde.* And p. 1. this receiving doth ſuppoſe that former receiving: ſo that we may from hence judge this to have been the Primitive inſtitution, that ſome ſhould Communicate with the Prieſt, and that as *Walafrid Strabo* ſaies, *it was only a lawfull Maſs, in which there was the Prieſt, thoſe that anſwer, and thoſe who offer, and communicate*; *ſicut ipſa compoſitio precum evidenti ratione demonſtrat*, as the frame of the prayers (ſaies he) evidently ſhews: and I add (as I have now inſtanced) that the expreſſions yet retained are contrary to their preſent Practice, and Doctrine.

Secondly, I inſtance in the Doctrine of *merit*, in this indeed I cannot

not see much difference betwixt the moderate *Romanists* and us, as *Spalato* * and *Forbes* † observe, for they will tell us, *that they account good works meritorious, not for the value, and worth of the work it self: but from Gods acceptation, promise, and appointment*, and so *Cassander* * saies, that the *Schoolmen* and other *Ecclesiasticks* did not differ from this opinion, for they placed the force of the merit of their righteousnes, in Gods free acceptation, and liberal promise, and that their righteousnes what ever it was, was Gods gift, and due by right of service to him, &c. yet if we consult the *Jesuits*, and rigid writers among the *Romanists*, they will tell us, *that our works do merit from the dignity of the work*: so *Bellarmine* saies †, *that it is communis & verissima Theologorum sententia*, that there is a *meritum de condigno, that there is a strict equallity betwixt the worth of the work it self, and the reward*: and from *Vasquez* * we have this assertion *that good works*

* *De Rep. Eccles. l. 7. c. 7. n. 8.*
† *Confid. Modest. a. l. 5. c. 4.*
* *Consult. ad Art. 6. de operibus bonis.*
† *De Iustif. l. 5. c. 16.*
* *In 1 secundæ. Tom. 2. Q. 114. Disp. 214. c. 5.*

of

of juſt perſons are of themſelves without any covenant or acception worthy of the reward of Eternal life, and have an equall value of condignity to the attaining Eternall glory. This opinion they think is backt by the Council which *Anathematizes* them, who deny that good works done by the grace of God, and merit of Chriſt, do truly deſerve increaſe of grace and Eternall glory:* and the intereſt of this opinion hath ſo far prevailed, that whereas in the *ordo baptizandi cum modo viſitandi*, &c. Printed at *Venice* 1575, there was this queſtion propoſed to the dying man, *Credis non propriis meritis, ſed paſſionis Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti virtute & merito ad gloriam pervenire?* doſt thou believe that thou ſhalt come to glory not by thy own merits, but by the virtue and merit of Jeſus Chriſts paſſion? and this was alſo propoſed to him, doſt thou believe that Jeſus Chriſt died for our Salvation, and that none can be ſaved by his own merits, or by any other means,

* *Conc. Trident. Seſſ. 6. Can. 32.*

means, but by the merits of his passion? both these are commanded to be expunged by the *Index expurgatorius* of Card. *Quiroga** 1584. and also by that of Cardinal *Sandoval*, 1612. This expression is also expunged out of *Erasmus* Annotations, in the first Chapter of St. *Luke* on these words *they shall call me blessed*; Then Gods name is glorified when nothing is ascribed to our own merits, but the whole to Gods mercy: this Doctrine of merit though disliked by the moderate sort, and hardly owned where they converse with *Protestants* is yet stifly maintained as the common opinion in those Countries which are intirely *Popish*, seems to be countenanced by the decree of the Council, and more fully by those who have been imployed in purging *Heretical* books, yet notwithstanding all this, the prayers which may be found in the Offices are no way reconcileable with it; for though in their disputes with men, they pretend the merit of their works,

* *Index. Expurg. per Card. Quirog. Madrit. 1584. & recus. Hanoviæ. 1611.*

works, yet in their Prayers to God they fly to his ſole mercy: ſo they ſing* *mundo corde, corpore Paradiſo redde tuo nos ſolâ clementiâ*: bring us by thy alone mercy to thy Paradiſe with clean heart, and body: and in the Prayer which begins *nobis quoque*, in the Canon of the Maſs, they beg, that God would bring them into the ſociety of Saints, *non æſtimator meriti, ſed veniæ largitor*, not eſteeming their merits, but pardoning their offences: if there could be any exact merit, which from its own dignity deſerves glory, why do they then fly to his ſole mercy? and if the whole be not aſcribed to Gods mercy, but mans merits, why do they beg that God would not weigh their merits but pardon their offences?

* *In dedic. Sancti Mich. Archang. ad veſperas in Himn. tibi Chriſte.*

Thirdly, I inſtance in the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, with their Prayers for the dead, the Doctrine of the *Romaniſts* is, *that the Souls in Purgatory are helped by the Suffrages of the Faithfull*

* *Conc. Trident. Sess. 25.*

† *S.C. Answer to Dr. Pierce. c. 10. Sect. 12.*

full, for after Death those Souls which have not been throughly purged, in this life are carried into a place of torment, where they are detained till hey are throughly purged, and then are carried into Heaven: and *p.* they pray for those *that God will forgive their sins and assuage their sufferings* *, &c. for those who are very good they give thanks, but for those who are in this middle estate they pray for pardon and Mercy; and that not only on the day of their Buriall, but also also the on third, on the seventh, on the thirtieth, and on the *anniversary* of their death they say Mass for their Souls, and by this hope to rid them quickly out of Purgatory: now the Prayers they use are irreconciliable with this Doctrine. For *First*, there are Prayers for those whom they believe to be in Heaven, even for the greatest Saints: this *S.C.* * Confesses was anciently so, but then they were not such Prayers as were Made for the imperfect (*i*) for remission

* *Answer to Dr. Pierce c. 10 Sect. 10.*

sion of sins refreshment, &c. but for accession of glory to Saints already glorified, but there is more than so: for they use the same request for those, who (they say) are in Purgatory, and for those we all believe to be in glory: they pray for all that rest in Christ, that God would give them a place of refreshment, light, and peace *; now if the Saints rest in Christ then they are included in this Prayer, and they beg for the Saints who are glorified refreshment and peace, which is the request, (*S. C.* Saies) that is to be made for imperfect *Christians.* And wee find such a prayer, that God by whose mercy the Soul's of the faithfull rest, would grant to all thy servants here and every where resting in Christ, pardon of sin, that being absolved from all guilt, they may rest with thee for ever *: and there was a prayer for St. *Leo*, *ut per hæc placationis officia illum beata retributio comitetur* *; that by these offices of atonement a blessed retribution may accompany him: what do these

* *Commem. pro defunct. in Can. Missa.*

† *In orationibus pro his qui in Cæmit. requiesc.*

* *In festo Sancti Leonis oratio secreta.*

words signefie? not an increase of glory, but simply that he may have glory, not an addition of happines but simply that a blessed reward may accompany him: and how can the Sacrifice they offer here be understood to be a thanksgiven for Leo, (as it must be for those who are very good) when it's call'd an office of atonement *Secondly*, there are no prayers in their publique offices for deliverance from *Purgatory* that they may be quickly eased of their paines, and delivered from torments, and if there be no prayer for speedy ease of those pains, and quick riddance from them, then their prayers are not suitable to their Doctrine. The Prayers are either *First* to prevent falling into punishment; so in the office of buriall, they Pray that God would receive the soul returning to him, and cloath it with an Heavenly Garment, and wash it with the holy fountain of eternal life: and in the next Prayer, they Pray * that God would receive the soul of his servant, which he hath

* *in offic. Sepult. Oratio: Suscipe domine.*

hath called from the priſon of the body, and free it from the Princes of darknes, and the places of puniſhments, that being delivered from the bond of his ſins he may obtain the bleſſing of eternal reſt, and light: and this *Antiphona* is ſung, when the body is caried to the Church * *help O ye Saints, meet him O ye Angils of the Lord receiving his Soule, and offering it in the ſight of the higheſt: let Chriſt receive thee who cal'd thee, and carry thee into Abrahams boſome:* and ſo in the prayer, *O God to whom all things do live*, &c. *they intreat that God would command the Soul of his Servant to be received by the hands of his holy Angels, and to be carried into the boſome of the Patriarchs:* and in the prayer *fac quæſumus*, &c. *that he may not receive any recompence of his actions in puniſhments, who hath in his deſires kept thy will:* I'le inſtance in one prayer more: *Deus origo pietatis*, &c. where they deſire, that the Soul may indure no treacheries of the devil meeting him, that God would

* *Offic. ſepult Antiph. ſubvenite.*

free him from the infernall Gulfe, and deliver him from the cruel burnings of a hot Hell, placing it in the pleasure of Paradise: *Let it not feel O merciſull Father the heat of the flames, the anguiſh of puniſhments, or the horror of darkneſs, but being prevented by thy bounty may obtain to eſcape the Judgment of revenge.* Now theſe prayers are not reconcileable with their grounds, for 'tis their Doctrine, that thoſe who dye in an imperfect ſtate muſt neceſſarily go to that place of purgation; but now in thoſe prayers, they deſire that God would receive the Soul when it comes out of the body, and free it from the *Prince* of darkneſs, and places of puniſhments, and that it may not feel the heat of the flames, but being prevented by Gods bounty may eſcape the Judgment of revenge. They pretend in their Doctrine, that by their prayers they free the Souls from the puniſhments they feel, for they neceſſarily muſt indure puniſhment, but the prayers themſelves

themſelves ſpeak of preventing the falling into puniſhment. And p. theſe prayers cannot be reconciled with their Doctrine. *Secondly*, there are Prayers, which ſuppoſe the ſoule as yet in it's paſſage, and p. they deſire, that it may not fall into puniſhment, but God would place it in the land of reſt and light. After the departure of the ſoul out of the body they pray, that God would receive the ſoul returning to him: *let Michael the Angel of the teſtament be preſent with him and vouchſafe by the hands of thy holy Angel to place him in the boſome of thy Patriarch* Abraham, *that being freed from the Prince of darkneſs, and places of puniſhments, no man may be Confounded with the errors of his nativity or ignorance*, &c. Now though this may ſeem ſutable, when the ſoul is newly gone out of the body, with thoſe, that think there is ſome ſpace of time betwixt the Souls departure, and its receiving its particular doome: but without ſuch a conceit,

*Offic. sepult. Orat. Te Domine, &c.

how can they pray at the burial *, that God would give his ſervant, whom he cal'd out of the whirlepool of this world a place of refreſhment, and light, that he may paſs by the gates of Hell, and the puniſhments of darkneſs, &c. If at the burial they pray that it may paſs by the gates of Hell, then the Soul is ſtill in its paſſage: and further they pray, that he may remain in the manſion of the *Saints*, and his ſpirit may receive no hurt: but if his ſpirit was in purgatory, then it would receive hurt: p⁹. by this prayer I underſtand, it is yet in a capacity to receive no hurt, and p⁹. the Soul muſt yet be in its paſſage: and ſo it is plain from the *Abſolution*, where he ſaies, *the Lord Jeſu Chriſt abſolve thee from all the bond of thy ſins, and I pray thou mayeſt be abſolved before the Tribunal of Jeſus Chriſt*; this ſuppoſes, that the Soul is yet in its paſſage to this Tribunal, or why ſhould he pray for this abſolution before the Tribunal, if he hath already received the ſentence of that Tribunal?

Tribunal? there is another prayer, *that God would receive the Soul of his Servant freed from Corporal bonds into the peace of his Saints, that being Translated into the Region of the living, it may escape the place of punishment, and the fire of Hell:* all this supposes that the Soul hath not yet its doome, but is now in its passage: and so, when the body is carrying to the grave, they desire, *that the Angels would meet him, and receive his Soul, and lead him into Paradise, and the Martyrs receive him into their assembly*; and when the body is laid in the grave, still they pray, *that the Soul being prevented with the gift of thy bounty, it may obain to escape the Judgment of revenge**. Nor do they end here, but they use such expressions on the *Trental* and *Anniversary*, as in the *Offertory*, *in Anniversario defunctorum: free them from the mouth of the Lyon, let not Hell swallow them up, let not them fall into the dark place, but let the standard bearer St. Michael bring them into the holy Light*, &c. and the prayers in the *commendatio animarum* which

* *In Oratione Deus Origo pietatis*, &c.

Offic. sepult. sec. usum. Sarum. in rubrica, pag. 103.

ſuppoſe the Soul even then in its paſſage are uſed at the *Trental* and *Anniverſary*: but why ſhould thoſe words which commend it in its paſſage be uſed at theſe times, if they did not ſuppoſe the Soul yet in its way? thus theſe prayers contradict their received grounds of *Purgatory*, and prayer for the dead, for if the prayers they uſe, ſtill ſuppoſe them in this paſſage, and not come into torment, then they muſt contradict their uſual Doctrine, which concludes them preſently in torment, and that by thoſe prayers they may be ſpeedily delivered from the torment they are in. *Thirdly*, There are other prayers which deſire that the Soul may be freed from Eternal puniſhments, that Hell may not ſwallow them up, and they may not fall into the place of darkneſs*; and in the firſt prayer at that *Maſs* they pray for *the Soul of thy Servant whom thou haſt commanded this day to depart out of this world, that thou wilt not deliver him into the hand of the enemy, nor forget it finally*, &c. and becauſe he hoped and believed in thee, that

* *Miſſa. in die obitus Offertor.*

that he may not ſuſtain the pains of *Hell*, but poſſeſs joyes everlaſting. This prayer anciently run that he might not ſuſtain *pœnas æternas*, but now this is altered in *pœnas inferni*, yet ſtill if they take the word *Hell*, for *Purgatory*, then they pray that God would not ſuffer it to come into Purgatory, which is contrary to their own Doctrine, that every man not throughly purged in this life, muſt be purged in Purgatory. If they underſtand it of the Hell of the damned, and of eternal puniſhments, as there is a Prayer to be uſed at the funeral of a *Cardinal*, that by the aſſiſtance of Gods grace he may obtaine to eſcape the Judgment of everlaſting revenge *, if they underſtand it thus, then I aske, whether they ſuppoſe thoſe perſons for whom they pray are very wicked, or indifferently good: if they be very wicked, then it would be abſurd to pray for their deliverance from everlaſting damnation; for it is certain (ſaies *Bellarmine* *) that the Prayers do not profit the damned, for they can not be helped: if they be indifferently good, ſuch as dye in a ſtate

* *Ceremon. Eccl. Rom. l. 1. ſect. 15. c. 1. fol. 152.*

* *l. 2. de purgatorio. c. 18.*

state of grace though with some venial sins, then why do they pray *that he might not fall into Hell*? for this is already certain: or *that God would not forget them finally, but command them to be received by the holy Angells, and brought into the Country of Paradise*; for it is certain, God cannot forget them finally, but the longest duration of Purgatory is only till the resurrection: or why do they pray *that they may not sustain the pains of Hell, but possess joyes everlasting, and that they may escape Eternall revenge*? if their only design was to free the Soul from the torments of Purgatory, why is there nothing of ease in Purgatory? nothing of quick riddance from thence? (as they pretend from the apparitions of Souls which have been in Purgatory, and said they were freed by the Masses and prayers of the living) yea further, there is one prayer, which refers the pardon of sin to the resurrection: in the prayer which begins, *Te Domine Sancte*, &c. they pray, *Let his Spirit receive no hurt, but when the great day of the resurrection comes, vouchsafe to raise him with the Saints*

Offic. Sepult. sec. usum Sarum.

Saints and blot out all his offences and ſins even unto the laſt farthing: now if by the prayers of the living they can procure pardon, then there would not be a farthing to be blotted out at the reſurrection: and ſo this prayer would be uſeleſs All this while we meet with no prayer to put an end to their torments, to free them quickly from the pains they are now in: they'le tell us indeed, they pray for refreſhment and pardon of ſins, and where muſt they be for whom they pray thus, except in Purgatory? but this doth not follow; for, *Firſt*, There are ancient prayers extant, in which they prayed even to give reſt to them, whom they believed already to be in reſt: and therefore this doth not ſuppoſe them in Purgatory: ſo in St. *James* Liturgy (as it is cal'd) he prayes for all from *Abel* the juſt untill this preſent day, that God would give them reſt in the kingdom of heaven: and ſo in *Alcuinus* *, he prayes for the ſpirits of thy ſervants, and handmaids which thou haſt called to thee from the beginning of the world, that thou wouldeſt vouchſafe to give them a lightſome

* *Offic. per Ferias. Col.* 228. *Oper. Edit.* Paris 1917.

lightſome place, a place of refreſhment and eaſe. *Secondly*, I gather that they were not in Purgatory, from that commemoration of the dead, which *S. C.* mentions, for thoſe who are gone before us with the ſigne of faith, and repoſe in the ſleep of peace, and reſt in Chriſt refreſhment, light and peace; for the *Romaniſts* ſuppoſe the torments to be greater, than the greateſt torments of this life; now how do they repoſe in the ſleep of peace, when they indure both a puniſhment of loſs in the want of the ſight of God, and a puniſhment of ſenſe? how do they reſt in Chriſt, when they are perhaps in far greater torments than they in this life? *whereas Thoſe who dye in the Lord reſt from their labours**. *Thirdly*, Though the prayer runs, *that God would abſolve him from his ſins*, yet ſtill there is no neceſſity, that there ſhould be a Purgatory; for thoſe prayers may ſuppoſe as you ſee many do, the Soul yet to be in ſuſpence, and in its paſſage to Gods tribunal, and that they uſe the *commendatio animæ* at the buriall, or *Trentall* which they

* *Rev.* 14. 13.

they did, when the Soul just went out of the body, so that these prayers rather signifie a prevention of punishment, than any mitigation or ending of it: or again these prayers may refer to the resurrection, for it is not said, absolve him from the bond of his sins, that he may be presently released from Purgatory, but *that in the glory of the resurrection being raised among the Saints, he may breath again:* and so we have such a prayer in the *Pontifical*, which begins, *Deus cui omnia vivunt*, &c. *that God would command the Soul of his Servant to be received by the holy Angels, and carried into the bosome of Abraham his friend, and be raised at the last day: and what ever faults by the deceit of the devil be incur'd, thou of thy pitty and mercy wash away by forgiving them.* Here is a prayer for pardon, but then 'tis at the resurrection, and thus though there are prayers for pardon, yet still they are no way reconcileable with their Doctrine. Thus I have finished the *considerations* which at present I intend and (perhaps if occasion offer it self (may add more: my conclusion is a

request

requeſt to thoſe who begin to entertain ſuch fair opinions of the *Romiſh* Church, that they would not exchange their *Religion*, before they conſider, what they ſhall gain by the bargain: I ſee many who did not much minde to underſtand the *duties* of their own religion, much leſs to practice them, are eaſily drawn over to the *Romiſh* party, and when they live like *Atheiſts*, at leaſt to ſeem ſome body, they pretend to be *Papiſts*: I envy them not ſuch *Proſelites*, who add nothing to the repute of any ſide, but only number: nor do we looſe any thing by ſuch *Renegado's* whoſe practice diſgraced their profeſſion: the Church is purer when the dregs are purged out: *Rome* had at firſt wanted men to inhabite it if *Romulus* had not opened an *Aſylum*, and modern *Rome* would not be ſo much repleniſhed, if there were not a Sanctuary to ſhelter ſuch converts: 'tis hardly any matter what religion men profeſs if their practice be not anſwerable, and p. though they glory in their multitudes, yet many who ſeem to be of their religion, would prove (if they

were

were fiſted) of none at all. There are others well meaning perſons, who (as in Charity I muſt judge) are moved either through affection to *peace*, or *love* to truth (as they think) to incline to the *Romiſh* Church: theſe I do not condemn for their love to peace: 'Tis a noble deſign in imitation of the good *Samaritan* to poure Oyle and Wine into the Churches wounds and reconcile brethren who are at od's: and God forbid but we ſhould meet them for peaces ſake ſo far as we can without prejudice to piety and truth: but what benefit can we expect by our conceſſions? when they pretend (whatever we can judge from *Scripture*, *reaſon* or *Antiquity*) they cannot erre: yea the leaſt conceſſion that they have erred or can erre, oreturns their foundation, deſtroies the *Infallibility* of their Church. What hopes to reclaim them to moderation, when thoſe who mediate for peace are looked on as enemies? *Eraſmus*, *Modrevius and Caſſander* are in their account *damnati authores* and if they be not high flow'n *Papiſts* they account

account them (though they die in the communion of their Church) but only close *Heriticks*. I do not condemn those who are inquisitive after truth, and ready to imbrace that which is attended with sutable motives. To these p. I offer these considerations, whether 'tis fit to adhere to that Church which requires all to believe those Doctrines, as necessary to salvation which are uncertain, and dubious? to imbrace those for *Apostolical* Traditions which are not such? to receive those *Ecclesiastical* rites for wholsome and good, of which many are vain and fooliſh, and cannot be excused from *Superstition*? Let them consider, whether it be fit to adhere to that Church, whose sacred Offices contain many untruths and impieties? and *Lastly*, whose very prayers do in many things contradict their avowed Doctrine? he that can swallow down such considerations and turn *Romanist*, has (as I may judg) bidden adiew to his reason, as well as Religion.

Soli Deo Gloria.

FINIS.